Class 265.36R Book St 71
General Theological Seminary Library
Chelsea Square, New York

PRESENTED BY
Soc'y for Promoting Religion and Learning

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

https://archive.org/details/reservedsacramen0000darw_h4d7

Handbooks of Catholic Faith and Practice

EDITED BY W. J. SPARROW SIMPSON, D.D.

THE RESERVED SACRAMENT

HANDBOOKS OF
CATHOLIC FAITH AND PRACTICE

Cloth, each **2***s.* **6***d.* net.

INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY OF MORAL THEOLOGY. By the Rev. F. G. Belton, B.A.

MONASTICISM. By the Rev. Father Denys, M.A.

CHURCH MUSIC. By the Rev. A. S. Duncan-Jones, M.A.

SOME DEFECTS IN ENGLISH RELIGION. By the Rev. J. Neville Figgis, D.D.

THE INTERMEDIATE STATE.

SACRIFICE, JEWISH AND CHRISTIAN. By the Rev. S. C. Gayford, M.A.

CATHOLIC OR ROMAN CATHOLIC? By the Rev. T. J. Hardy, M.A.

CONSCIENCE OF SIN. By the Rev. T. A. Lacey, M.A.

THE LATER TRACTARIANS. By the Rev. Canon S. L. Ollard, M.A.

THE COMMUNION OF SAINTS. By the Rev. H. Leonard Pass, M.A.

RECENT FRENCH TENDENCIES. By the Rev. G. C. Rawlinson, M.A.

CHRISTIANITY AND THE ARTIST. By R. Ellis Roberts.

THE PRAYER OF CONSECRATION. By the Rev. W. J. Sparrow Simpson. Introduction by the Lord Bishop of Oxford.

THE RESERVED SACRAMENT. By the Rev. Darwell Stone, D.D.

EUCHARISTIC SACRIFICE. By the Rev. Darwell Stone, D.D.

THE SACRAMENT OF PENANCE. By the Rev. H. U. Whelpton, M.A.

THE EPISCOPATE AND THE REFORMATION. By the Rev. Professor J. P. Whitney, D.D.

THE PLACE OF WOMEN IN THE CHURCH. Introduction by the Rev. W. J. Sparrow Simpson, D.D.

LONDON: ROBERT SCOTT,
Roxburghe House, Paternoster Row, E.C.

THE RESERVED SACRAMENT

By

DARWELL STONE, D.D.

PRINCIPAL OF PUSEY HOUSE, OXFORD

GENERAL THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY NEW YORK

LONDON: ROBERT SCOTT
ROXBURGHE HOUSE
PATERNOSTER ROW, E.C.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:
THE YOUNG CHURCHMAN CO.
MILWAUKEE, WIS.

MCMXVII

All rights reserved

265.36 R
St 71
63388

WORKS BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

EUCHARISTIC SACRIFICE. Crown 8vo, 2*s.* 6*d.* net.

HOLY BAPTISM. (Oxford Library of Practical Theology.) Crown 8vo, 5*s.*

THE HOLY COMMUNION. (Oxford Library of Practica Theology.) Crown 8vo, 5*s.*

OUTLINES OF CHRISTIAN DOGMA. Crown 8vo, 7*s.* 6*d.*

CHRIST AND HUMAN LIFE. Crown 8vo, 2*s.* 6*d.* net.

OUTLINES OF MEDITATIONS FOR USE IN RETREAT. Crown 8vo, 2*s.* 6*d.* net.

THE LAW OF CHRISTIAN MARRIAGE, ESPECIALLY IN RELATION TO THE DECEASED WIFE'S SISTER'S MARRIAGE ACT. (Pusey House Occasional Papers.) Crown 8vo, sewed, 3*d.* net.

A HISTORY OF THE DOCTRINE OF THE HOLY EUCHARIST. Two volumes, 8vo, 30*s.* net.

THE INVOCATION OF SAINTS. New and enlarged edition, 8vo. Paper covers, 1*s.* net; cloth, 1*s.* 6*d.* net.

EPISCOPACY AND VALID ORDERS IN THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH. (Pusey House Occasional Papers. Crown 8vo, sewed 1*s.* net.

DIVORCE AND RE-MARRIAGE. (Pusey House Occasional Papers.) Crown 8vo, sewed, 1*s.* net.

THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH. Crown 8vo, 7*s.* 6*d.* net.

THE CHURCH: ITS MINISTRY AND AUTHORITY. Small Fcap, 8vo, 1*s.* net.

CONTENTS

PAGE

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION 7

CHAPTER II

COMMUNION OF THOSE ABSENT FROM CHURCH IN THE EARLY CENTURIES . . . 11

CHAPTER III

COMMUNION OF THE SICK IN MEDIAEVAL AND MODERN TIMES 23

CHAPTER IV

THE USE OF THE RESERVED SACRAMENT FOR OTHER PURPOSES THAN COMMUNION . 51

PAGE

CHAPTER V

DOCTRINAL AND PRACTICAL CONSIDERATIONS 77

APPENDIX. MOST IMPORTANT PASSAGES REFERRED TO 117

INDEX OF SUBJECTS 140

INDEX OF QUOTATIONS 141

THE RESERVED SACRAMENT

CHAPTER I

Introduction

OF recent years many circumstances have combined to force questions relating to the reservation of the Holy Eucharist into notice in England. And the time seems to call for a presentation such as is attempted in this book which shall add to a statement of historical facts some consideration of arguments from doctrinal truth and practical needs.

For many years the attitude of English Church people towards the Church of Rome has been changing. Many of

them have got rid of much unreasoning hostility and blind prejudice. Partly this has been the result of closer intercourse in public and social life. Partly it has been due to study and thought. No small influence has been exercised by foreign travel. Brief visits or longer residence abroad have given much greater familiarity with Roman Catholic worship. Those who have not in the least abandoned their reasoned rejection of the papal claims have learnt to appreciate a good deal in the Church of Rome of which they were formerly ignorant or which they misunderstood. And many while they pondered the ways of religious life have found it impossible to ignore that great part in Roman Catholic devotion which has its centre in the reserved Sacrament.

The same need for thought has been pushed forward in quite a different way. The claim of the sick and the dying to

receive Communion has been found, especially in large towns, to require some other method of administration than a Celebration at the bedside. Many medical men have explained the advantages, from their point of view, in Communion being administered to the sick without a Celebration at the time. Many devoted parish priests have affirmed their conviction that, if they are to do their duty to their flocks, they must be able to take Communion from the reserved Sacrament. And since the outbreak of war in August 1914, a great and pathetic emphasis has been laid on the need of reservation in military hospitals and at the front.

Side by side with this felt need in regard to Communion there has been a development in prayer. The reserved Sacrament, hidden away in private oratories and Sisterhood chapels for more than fifty years past, has been brought,

with a greater or less degree of prominence, into parish churches. Quietly and steadily private and individual prayer before the Sacrament in church has become the custom of many. In some few places more public methods of devotion have been adopted.

The result has been that, whatever opinions any may form, the question cannot be ignored. At meetings of clergymen and lay people it has been a frequent subject of discussion. In private conversations among Church people it is constantly raised. The records of Convocation show that anxiety about it has penetrated into the most official quarters. Only those who refuse to see can deny that it is urgent. And, if urgent questions are ignored, or if they are not considered with care and deliberation and calmness and real inquiry, there is a nemesis some day to be faced.

CHAPTER II

Communion of those Absent from Church in the Early Centuries

SO soon as definite places of common Christian worship came to be, it would be necessary to consider how Communion was to be given to those who for whatever reason were prevented from attending the ordinary place. The earliest indication of an answer to the question thus raised is in the *First Apology* of St. Justin Martyr. St. Justin was a convert from heathenism. In his Christian life he had knowledge of Rome and perhaps of Asia Minor also. His *First Apology* was written about the middle of the second century. In the course of it he twice describes the Celebration of the Holy Eucharist. In each

case he mentions the carrying of the Sacrament to those who were absent from the Celebration. "When the president has made the Thanksgiving,[1] and all the people have expressed their assent in the Amen, those who among us are called deacons give to each of those present a portion of the bread and wine and water, over which the Thanksgiving has been made, and they carry these to those who are absent." [2] "There is the distribution and the partaking by each one of those things over which the Thanksgiving has been said, and these are sent to those who are absent by the hands of the deacons." [3] Somewhat similarly, in the document known as the *Canons of Hippolytus* there is a provision that, if a presbyter is ill when the

[1] That is, the thanksgiving that is the Eucharist.

[2] St. Justin Martyr, *Apol.* i. 65. This passage and other passages referred to, are quoted fully in the Appendix.

[3] *Op. cit.* i. 67.

bishop celebrates on Sunday, a deacon is to take the Sacrament to him and the presbyter is to receive it by himself.[1] In these instances then there is evidence that for the purpose of Communion the Sacrament was sometimes carried from the Celebration in church to absent persons at the time of the Celebration.

Another method by which Communion was received at home was in the practice of allowing the faithful themselves to keep the Sacrament in their houses. There is evidence of this custom from Africa late in the second century and in the third century. Tertullian speaks of " the body of the Lord which has been received and kept " ;[2] and describes it as a familiar incident in the life of a Christian woman that she tastes in her house before all ordinary food a sacred bread.[3] St. Cyprian men-

[1] *Canons of Hippolytus*, 214, 215.
[2] Tertullian, *De orat.* 19.
[3] Idem, *Ad uxorem*, ii. 5.

tions an instance of "the holy thing of the Lord," that is the Eucharist, being kept in a house so as there to be received.[1] In some places this custom continued till late in the fourth century. St. Basil writing about the year 372 records that the hermits in the deserts, where there were no priests, had a store of the Eucharist from which they gave themselves Communion, and adds that in Alexandria and Egypt any of the faithful may have the Eucharist reserved in their houses and partake from it when they wish.[2] St. Jerome, writing about A.D. 393, mentions a custom at Rome of the faithful receiving Communion in their houses, apparently from

[1] St. Cyprian, *De lapsis*, 26.

[2] St. Basil, *Ep.* xciii. The interesting references to the reserved Eucharist in the long recension of Palladius, *Historia Lausiaca*, 9, 52, are omitted in the critical text edited by Dom Cuthbert Butler: see his *The Lausiac History of Palladius*, vol. ii, pages 29, 145.

the reserved Sacrament.[1] In these cases it is clear that the Communion of the sick was not specially in view; but obviously what was intended for any could be used for the sick when there was need.

Thirdly, the consecrated Sacrament was reserved in church or in the priest's house, and was taken thence at the time when it was needed for the Communion of a sick person. An instance in which the place of reservation may have been either the church or the priest's house occurs in a letter written by Dionysius Bishop of Alexandria, who died in A.D. 265, to Fabian Bishop of Antioch. An old Christian named Sarapion after many years of blameless life had committed apostasy by joining in a heathen sacrifice during persecution. He had often sought to be re-admitted to Communion in the Church, but his request had not been granted. He became ill and for three

[1] St. Jerome, *Ep.* xlviii. 15.

days was speechless and unconscious. Having rallied a little on the fourth day he asked his daughter's son to fetch a presbyter. The boy ran to the presbyter by night but found that he too was ill, and could not come to Sarapion. Dionysius the Bishop had ordered that those like Sarapion under discipline might be reconciled at the point of death. Consequently the presbyter "gave a small portion of the Eucharist to the boy and bade him moisten it and drop it into the old man's mouth. The boy returned with it. And, when he came near, before he had entered, Sarapion revived again and said, 'Are you here, child? And the presbyter could not come; but do quickly what he ordered, and let me depart.' And the boy moistened it, and as soon as he had poured it into his mouth, and he had swallowed a little, Sarapion at once gave up the ghost." [1]

[1] Dionysius of Alexandria *apud* Eusebius, *H.E.* vi. 44.

The reservation of the Sacrament in church at the time of the Donatist outrages in Africa about A.D. 316 is mentioned some fifty years later by St. Optatus the Bishop of Milevis. One of the ways in which the Donatists showed their rejection of the Eucharistic consecration in the Church was by the profanation of the Sacrament which they found reserved.[1] And in the riotous attack on St. Chrysostom and his adherents in A.D. 404 by the soldiers of the Emperor Arcadius the reserved Sacrament in the church of St. Sophia at Constantinople was profaned.[2] In the *Apostolic Constitutions,* probably written at Antioch towards the end of the fourth century, after the Communion of the people the deacons are directed to carry what remains into the sacristy,[3] but the object of this particular provision was

[1] St. Optatus, *De schis. Don.* ii. 19, 21.
[2] St. Chrysostom, *Ep. ad Innoc.* i. 3.
[3] *Const. Ap.* VIII. xiii. 4.

perhaps rather that this might then be consumed by the deacons than that it should be reserved.

In these three ways then—carrying direct from the Celebration, reservation in private houses, reservation in the church or in the priest's house—Communion appears to have been received in the early Church by those absent from the Celebration. There seem to have been different customs as to whether the Communion so received was in both kinds or in one kind only. The carrying from the Celebration described by St. Justin Martyr probably was in both kinds.[1] The custom of reserving at home referred to by Tertullian, St. Cyprian, and St. Basil appears to have been in the species of bread only. The reservation mentioned by Dionysius of

[1] This is not explicitly stated but appears to be a natural inference from the structure of the sentences.

Alexandria[1] and St. Optatus seems to contemplate the species of bread only. The Sacrament reserved in the church of St. Sophia at Constantinople in the time of St. Chrysostom evidently included the species of wine, for the spilling of "the most holy blood of Christ" is mentioned as a result of the riot. Also it is recorded by St. Jerome of Exuperius, Bishop of Toulouse at the beginning of the fifth century, that he carried the blood as well as the body of the Lord.[2]

Instances exist also of the Celebration of the Eucharist in an ordinary house or elsewhere apart from the church. St. Cyprian in A.D. 250 mentions the Celebrations in prison for the sake of the confessors confined there in time of persecution.[3] Dionysius of Alexandria,

[1] This appears to be implied by the moistening, probably with water possibly with wine, of the Sacrament which is directed.

[2] St. Jerome, *Ep.* cxxv. 20.

[3] St. Cyprian, *Ep.* v. 2.

writing about A.D. 263 of a time of civil war and pestilence, says that the feast of Easter was kept by those who were suffering persecution and that every place, "field, desert, ship, inn, prison became a place of assembly," that is for the Eucharist.[1] It is recorded of Lucian of Antioch, who died in A.D. 311 or 312, that, when he was about to die in prison and had no access to shrine or altar and could not move because of his bonds and wounds, he "celebrated the awful sacrifice on his own breast while lying down."[2] St. Ambrose of Milan, who died A.D. 397, is said by his contemporary Paulinus to have offered the sacrifice at Rome in the house of a certain illustrious lady.[3] St. Augustine, writing about A.D. 427, records an instance of

[1] Dionysius of Alexandria *apud* Eusebius, *H.E.* vii. 22.

[2] Philostorgius, *H.E.* ii. 13: cf. Symeon Metaphrastes, *Vita S. Luciani*, 14.

[3] Paulinus, *Vita S. Ambrosii*, 10.

the Eucharist being offered in a house for the special purpose of setting it free from the malicious influence of evil spirits.[1] And St. Paulinus of Nola, who died in A.D. 431, is stated by his contemporary Uranius to have ordered the Eucharist to be celebrated at his bedside when he was dying and was visited by bishops from elsewhere.[2] Such instances there are then of the Holy Eucharist being celebrated in places other than the church. But they appear to have been exceptional and for particular reasons and contrary to the ordinary practice. The general sense of the early Church appears to have been that, apart from emergency or special reason, the Eucharist ought not to be celebrated in an ordinary house. This general sense received expression in the decree of the Council of Laodicea sometime between A.D. 343 and A.D. 381 that "offer-

[1] St. Augustine, *De ciu. Dei*, XXII. viii. 6.

[2] Uranius, *Ep. de obitu S. Paulini*, 2.

ings of the sacrifice by bishops or presbyters must not take place in houses" [1] and in the rule of St. Basil, writing about A.D. 370, that neither on the one hand is an ordinary supper to be eaten and drunk in a church nor on the other hand may the Lord's Supper be insulted by being administered in a house unless under pressure of necessity some more than ordinarily pure place or house be found for it on a suitable occasion.[2] The Council *in Trullo* (A.D. 691) ratified the ordinary custom of earlier centuries that the Celebration of the Eucharist was restricted to the church, and at the same time made allowance for exceptions for special reasons, by enacting that the clergy might celebrate or baptize in oratories within houses only by the permission of the bishop of the place.[3]

[1] Council of Laodicea, can. 58.
[2] St. Basil, *Reg. breu. tract.* 310.
[3] Council *in Trullo*, can. 31.

CHAPTER III

Communion of the Sick in Mediaeval and Modern Times

THE middle ages inherited from the early Church the practice of which there is record in Africa early in the fourth century and at Constantinople in the first years of the fifth century by which the consecrated Sacrament is reserved in churches so that Communion may be taken from it to the sick. Characteristic instances may be seen in the eighth or ninth century composite document known as the *Excerpts of Egbert*, the enactments of the Council of Bourges in A.D. 1031, the Council held at Westminster in A.D. 1138, the Fourth Lateran Council (A.D. 1215), and the

Constitutions promulgated by John Peccham, Archbishop of Canterbury, at Reading in 1279 and at Lambeth in 1281. The *Excerpts of Egbert* require "that the presbyter have the Eucharist always ready for the sick, lest they die without Communion." [1] The Councils of Bourges and Westminster directed that the reserved Sacrament should be renewed weekly.[2] The Fourth Lateran Council ordered that the receptacle containing the Eucharist should be kept locked to prevent possible profanation.[3] The *Constitutions* of Peccham provided for careful and reverent treatment of the reserved Sacrament in every parish church, and for the carrying of it to the sick "with due reverence." [4] The

[1] *Excerpts of Egbert*, 22.

[2] Council of Bourges (A.D. 1031), can. 2; Council of Westminster (A.D. 1138), can. 2.

[3] Fourth Lateran Council (A.D. 1215), can. 20.

[4] Council of Reading (A.D. 1279), can. 7; Council of Lambeth (A.D. 1281), cap. 1.

famous canonist William Lyndwood, who after being successively Dean of Arches and Archdeacon of Oxford and Canon and Chancellor of Canterbury was Bishop of St. Davids from 1442 until his death in 1446, in citing and commenting on this provision discusses different methods of reservation. He thinks the English custom of reserving the Sacrament in a hanging vessel above the altar to be commended because it brings the Sacrament prominently before men's eyes and so makes adoration easier, but nevertheless, not to be commended because it is contrary to the direction of the canon law that the Eucharist is to be in a separate place, and because with it there is a greater risk of profanation. Therefore he prefers a custom which he had seen in Holland and Portugal of "a seemly separate place near the altar in which the Eucharist is placed to be kept locked

up within the wall or securely fastened place so that no one can get at the Eucharist itself except the parish priest who keeps the key." [1] Presumably the reservation contemplated by Archbishop Peccham was in the species of bread only since by this time in the Province of Canterbury even those who communicated in church received in one kind in many churches.[2]

In the Church of Rome at the present time the Eucharist is reserved usually in a tabernacle above the altar in cathedrals and parish churches and in the chapels of Religious Orders possessing papal sanction. It may be reserved in other private chapels habitually if papal leave has been obtained, or occasionally for a short time by the permission of the bishop of the diocese. By

[1] Lyndwood, *Provinciale*, iii. 25.

[2] See *e.g.* Council of Lambeth (A.D. 1281), cap. 1.

a decree of Pope Benedict XV dated June 22, 1915, faculties were granted allowing the reservation of the Sacrament in military camps and in ships of war during the present war.[1] It is customary to give Communion to the sick and also usually to those communicating in church from the reserved Sacrament. The reservation is in the species of bread only.

In the Eastern Church, as in the Church of Rome, the Eucharist is constantly reserved. But the method of reservation differs considerably. Each year on the Thursday before Easter particles of the consecrated species of bread are moistened with the consecrated species of wine and dried by means of heat so as to become hard and are kept for the Communion of the sick dur-

[1] The text of the decree is in *e.g. Ephemerides Liturgicae*, xxix. 522. For a note on the general rules see *op. cit.* xxx. 689, 690.

ing the ensuing year. During Lent there is a similar reservation from the Sunday Liturgy for the Communion of priest and people at the Liturgy of the Presanctified in the ensuing week. The Sacrament is reserved in a metal case on the altar, which in the East is hidden from the people except during portions of the Liturgy by the sanctuary screen with its closed doors.

In the Church of England great changes were introduced in the sixteenth century. There was no explicit alteration of the custom prevalent in England during the middle ages. But a new provision was made for communicating the sick, and reservation fell into disuse. The *First Prayer Book of King Edward VI*, issued in A.D. 1549, made two provisions for the Communion of the sick. First, it was directed that " If the same day there be a Celebration of the Holy Communion in the church, then shall

the priest reserve (at the open Communion) so much of the Sacrament of the body and blood as shall serve the sick person, and so many as shall communicate with him (if there be any); and so soon as he conveniently may after the open Communion ended in the church shall go and minister the same, first to those that are appointed to communicate with the sick (if there be any), and last of all to the sick person himself." Secondly, it was ordered that "if the day be not appointed for the open Communion in the church, then (upon convenient warning given) the curate shall come and visit the sick person afore noon. And having a convenient place in the sick man's house (where he may reverently celebrate) with all things necessary for the same, and not being otherwise letted with the public service or any other just impediment, he shall there celebrate the Holy

Communion." When the second alternative was adopted there was a further provision, "If there be more sick persons to be visited the same day that the curate doth celebrate in any sick man's house, then shall the curate (there) reserve so much of the Sacrament of the body and blood as shall serve the other sick persons, and such as be appointed to communicate with them (if there be any), and shall immediately carry it and minister it unto them." The *Second Prayer Book of King Edward VI*, issued in A.D. 1552, and the English Prayer Book of Queen Elizabeth, issued in A.D. 1559, omitted the provision for carrying the Sacrament from the church to the sick person, and simply appointed in the case of sick Communions that "having a convenient place in the sick man's house, where the curate may reverently minister, and a good number to receive the Communion

with the sick person,[1] with all things necessary for the same, he shall there minister the Holy Communion." The Latin Prayer Book of Queen Elizabeth, issued in A.D. 1560, with the sanction of letters patent from the Crown for the public use of the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge and the Colleges of Winchester and Eton and for the private use of the clergy contained the same two provisions for the Communion of the sick as those in the Prayer Book of 1549, though with the addition that, when the Sacrament is carried from the church to the sick man's house, some of those present at the Celebration in church are to go with the priest to the house

[1] An exception was allowed to this requirement in times of contagious diseases when fear of infection prevented any from being willing to communicate with the sick person. In these circumstances it was provided that "upon special request of the diseased the minister may alonely communicate with him."

and communicate there. The Prayer Book of 1661 relaxed the requirement of "a good number to receive the Sacrament with the sick person" to "three or two at the least," but made no alteration in the method of communicating the sick prescribed by the English Prayer Book of Queen Elizabeth. In this Book of 1661 a new rubric was added at the end of the Order of Holy Communion enacting that "if any of the bread and wine remain unconsecrated, the curate shall have it to his own use; but, if any remain of that which was consecrated, it shall not be carried out of the church, but the priest and such other of the communicants as he shall then call unto him shall immediately after the blessing reverently eat and drink the same," to prevent misinterpretation of the 1559 rubric "if any of the bread or wine remain, the curate shall have it to his own use," and the abuse of the consecrated

Sacrament being used for ordinary food.

The twenty-ninth Article in the Articles of Religion of 1553 contained the paragraph, "The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper was not commanded by Christ's ordinance to be kept, carried about, lifted up, nor worshipped." With slight verbal alterations this paragraph was retained in the Latin Articles of 1563 and the English Articles of 1571. The 1563 Article had "Sacramentum Eucharistiae ex institutione Christi non seruabatur circumferebatur elevabatur nec adorabatur"; the 1571 Article had "The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper was not by Christ's ordinance reserved, carried about, lifted up, or worshipped." Such words are not likely to have been written by those who approved of any method of reserving the Sacrament; but, so far as the obligatory character of the Articles is concerned, they cannot rightly

be interpreted as binding those who received them to more than that reservation and the other practices mentioned are not of the essence of the Eucharist. This interpretation is indicated both by the general character of the Articles and by the provision in the Latin Prayer Book of 1560 in use contemporaneously with the Articles of 1563 and 1571 for such reservation as there is in carrying the Sacrament from the Celebration in church to the sick.[1]

[1] The original form of the *Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum*, as completed at the end of King Edward VI's reign, contained the sentence, "Itaque nec in altum tolli sacramentum hoc nec circumferri patimur nec conseruari nec adorari" ("Therefore we do not allow this Sacrament to be lifted on high or to be carried about or to be reserved or to be worshipped"). In the Elizabethan edition "per agros" was added after "circumferri," and "in crastinum" after "conseruari" ("to be carried about through the fields"; "to be reserved till the next day"),

While reservation of any kind thus ceased to be practised in the Church of England, it has been customary in the Scottish Church. At the end of the Liturgy as revised in 1912 there is a note, "According to long existing custom in the Scottish Church the presbyter may reserve so much of the Consecrated Gifts as may be required for the Communion of the sick and others who could not be present at the Celebration in church. All that remaineth of the Holy Sacrament, and is not so required, the presbyter and such other of the communicants as he shall then call unto him shall after the blessing reverently

additions which may have been in view of the provisions of the Latin Prayer Book of Queen Elizabeth. See the edition by E. Cardwell, Oxford, 1850, pages 18, 19, 329. The *Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum*—a most mischievous book—received no sanction from either the Church or Parliament.

eat and drink." [1] This note records the traditional practice of the Scottish Church; and it is probable that during the continuance of the penal laws from A.D. 1746 to A.D. 1792, when the assembling of a congregation of Church people larger than four persons under a pastor ordained in the Scottish Church was forbidden, most Communions whether of the sick or of the whole were made from the reserved Sacrament. At present in those Scottish churches where the Sacrament is reserved the reservation is usually in both kinds; in many cases the place of reservation is a tabernacle on the altar, in other cases the Sacra-

[1] There were slight differences in earlier forms of this note. The words "a venerable custom" (or in some copies "the universal custom") were used instead of "long existing custom"; the word "priest" was used instead of "presbyter"; and the sentence beginning "All that remaineth" did not exist.

ment is placed in an aumbry in the chancel wall.[1]

The section of the Nonjurors known as the Usagers had service books of their own. The way for these books may have been to some extent paved by the eccentric divine William Whiston in his *The Liturgy of the Church of England reduced nearer the primitive standard*, published in 1713, which contained the provision, "Note that part of the remaining consecrated elements at the Lord's Supper are to be carried from the public congregation to the sick by a priest or sent by a deacon for their

[1] For the history and present use of reservation in Scotland see F. C. Eeles, *Reservation of the Holy Eucharist in the Scottish Church*. On page 46 there is an interesting letter from the Very Rev. W. Hatt, formerly Dean of Brechin, written in 1899, mentioning conversations of his mother, who was born in 1800, and his grandmother, who was born in 1773. "I never heard reservation for the sick and infirm spoken of as anything new, but always as a regular part of the Scottish Church system."

private and devout participation at home." [1] The Nonjuring book issued in 1717 was a republication of the *First Prayer Book of King Edward VI* with some alterations. It did not contain any order for the Visitation or Communion of the Sick.[2] Another book was published in 1718 entitled *A Communion Office taken partly from the Primitive Liturgies and partly from the First English Reformed Common-Prayer-Book: together with Offices for Confirmation and the Visitation of the Sick,*[3] which was the work of Thomas Brett, Jeremy Collier, and Thomas Deacon. At the end of the Order of Holy Communion there was a rubric, " If there be any persons who through sickness or any other

[1] This book is in P. Hall, *Fragmenta Liturgica*, vol. iii: see page 180.

[2] This book is in P. Hall, *Fragmenta Liturgica*, i. 101–147.

[3] This book is in P. Hall, *Fragmenta Liturgica*, v. 1–78.

urgent cause are under a necessity of communicating at their houses, then the priest shall reserve at the open Communion so much of the Sacrament of the body and blood as shall serve those who are to receive at home. And if, after that or if then none are to communicate at their houses, any of the consecrated elements remain, then it shall not be carried out of the church, but the priest and such other of the communicants as he shall then call unto him shall immediately after the blessing reverently eat and drink the same." The order for the Communion of the Sick made the same two provisions as those in the *First Prayer Book of King Edward VI*,[1] though with a slight addition in the second provision so that this ran, "But if the day be not appointed for the open Communion in the church, or if there be a necessity for the sick

[1] See pages 28–30, above.

person to receive the Eucharist before the time of public Celebration," the words " or if there be a necessity for the sick person to receive the Eucharist before the time of public Celebration " being added to the First Prayer Book. Other books of the Nonjurors contained directions for continuous reservation. Thomas Deacon's *A Complete Collection of Devotions taken from the Apostolical Constitutions, the Ancient Liturgies, and the Common Prayer Book of the Church of England,* published in 1734, ordered, " Note, the priest shall always consecrate more than is necessary for the communicants ; and the remainder of the consecrated elements he shall carefully reserve for the use of the sick, or other persons who for any urgent cause desire to communicate at their houses. But, if there be not persons enow to receive the reserved elements, the priest and deacon shall devoutly and rever-

ently receive them either together or separately on one day or more according to their discretion, always observing that some of the consecrated elements be constantly reserved in the vestry or some other convenient place in the church under a safe lock, of which both the priest and deacon are to have a key"; "When a sick person not able to come to the church is desirous to receive the Eucharist in his house, he must give timely notice to the priest, signifying also how many there are to communicate with him. Upon which the priest as soon as he conveniently may shall carry a proper quantity of the consecrated Eucharistic elements which were reserved at the public Communion to the sick person's house." [1] With slight verbal differences a similar provision for reservation was made in

[1] This book is in P. Hall, *Fragmenta Liturgica*, vol. vi: see pages 153, 229.

Thomas Rattray's *An Office for the sacrifice of the Holy Eucharist being the ancient Liturgy of the Church of Jerusalem*, published in 1744, with the added instruction, "but he shall take care that they [the reserved consecrated elements] never be too long kept, but renewed from time to time."[1] A like provision without this added instruction was in *Devotions to be used by primitive Catholics at church and at home*, published at Liverpool in 1747.[2]

Among the divines who took part in the preparations for the Prayer Book of 1661 were John Cosin, who had been consecrated Bishop of Durham on December 2, 1660, Anthony Sparrow, who became Bishop of Exeter in 1667 and Bishop of Norwich in 1678, and Herbert Thorndike. There are indications of

[1] This book is in P. Hall, *Fragmenta Liturgica*, vol. i: see page 177.

[2] *Devotions to be used by primitive Catholics at church and at home*, page 90.

varying degrees of definiteness that no one of these was opposed to all methods of Reservation. In Cosin's *Liturgica siue annotata ad diuina officia*, known as the Third Series of his *Notes and Collections on the Book of Common Prayer*, written before the 1661 revision, he referred with apparent approval to the rubrics of the *First Prayer Book of King Edward VI* concerning the Communion of the sick.[1] Sparrow published his

[1] In the edition of Cosin's *Works* in the *Anglo-Catholic Library*, v. 496. Cosin does not allude to any possibility of reservation in another passage (v. 524), where such an allusion might be expected if he thought reservation lawful. In his *Paper concerning the Differences in the chief points of Religion betwixt the Church of Rome and the Church of England*, he puts together Elevation, Exposition, Processions of the Sacrament, "carrying" "to the sick," and other customs as "some pernicious," "some unnecessary, many false, and many fond, and none of them to be imposed on the Church" (*Works*, iv. 334), but does not distinguish in which groups the different customs are to be placed.

work entitled *A Rationale upon the Book of Common Prayer* in the year 1657, and in his comments on the office for the Communion of the Sick, his citation of much more of the 1549 rubrics concerning the Communion of the sick than is needed for his immediate purpose seems to indicate that he regarded those directions as at least unobjectionable; and this passage, like most of the book, remained unaltered in the last edition, published in 1684, four years before the author's death, and twenty-three years after the revision of the Prayer Book in 1661.[1] Thorndike, in his treatise *The Reformation of the Church of England better than that of the Council of Trent*, written during the last two years of his life and not less than nine years after the revision of the Prayer Book in 1661,

[1] A. Sparrow, *A Rationale upon the Book of Common Prayer*, pages 223, 224 in the edition of 1722.

referred incidentally to Reservation in the following terms, "And thus far I will particularize as concerning the Eucharist, that the Church is to endeavour the celebrating of it so frequently that it may be reserved to the next Communion. For in the mean time it ought to be so ready for them that pass into the next world that they need not stay for the consecrating of it on purpose for every one. The reason of the necessity of it for all which has been delivered aggravates it very much in danger of death. And the practice of the Church attests it to the utmost. Neither will there be any necessity of giving it in one kind only, as by some passages of antiquity may be collected, if common reason could deceive in a subject of this nature." [1] The existence of a pyx bear-

[1] H. Thorndike, *The Reformation of the Church of England better than that of the Council of Trent*, chap. xxxix; in the edition of Thorndike's *Works* in the *Anglo-Catholic Library*, v. 578.

ing an inscription that it was used by Bishop Jeremy Taylor, who was consecrated Bishop of Down, Connor, and Dromore on January 27, 1661, has been thought to show that he reserved the Sacrament, probably during the time when he was deprived of his benefice of Uppingham under the Commonwealth, and possibly also after he became bishop.[1]

In the proceedings of Convocation in recent years, with a view to the revision of the Prayer Book under the Royal Letters of Business, new rubrics at the end of the office for the Communion of the Sick have been drawn up and have

[1] See Christopher Wordsworth in *The Prayer Book Dictionary*, pages 609, 611; V. Staley, *The Ceremonial of the English Church* (second edition 1900), page 223, and in *Hierurgia Anglicana* (new edition, 1903), ii. 164. There is a statement concerning the reception of Communion by sick persons in Jeremy Taylor's *The Rule and Exercises of Holy Dying*, V. iv. 12.

received provisional assent. These provide, " But when the Holy Communion cannot reverently or without grave difficulty be celebrated in private, and also when there are several sick persons in the parish desirous to receive the Communion on the same day, it shall be lawful for the priest (with the consent of the sick person) on any day when there is a Celebration of the Holy Communion in the Church to set apart at the open Communion so much of the consecrated bread and wine as shall serve the sick person (or persons), and so many as shall communicate with him (if there be any). And, the open Communion ended, he shall, on the same day and with as little delay as may be, go and minister the same. And, except where extreme sickness shall otherwise require, before he administer the consecrated bread and wine, at least the parts of the appointed office here named shall

be used, namely, the General Confession, the Absolution, and the Prayer of Humble Access, and, after the delivery of the bread and wine with the appointed words, the Lord's Prayer and the Blessing. And immediately thereafter any of the bread and wine that remains over shall reverently be consumed. If the consecrated bread and wine be not taken immediately to the sick person, they shall be kept in such place and after such manner as the Ordinary shall approve, so that they be not used for any other purpose whatsoever. The consecrated bread and wine shall be taken to the sick person in such simple and reverent manner as the Ordinary shall approve. If any question arise as to the manner of doing anything that is here enjoined or allowed, it shall be referred to the Ordinary for his decision." [1]

[1] See the Report of the Joint Committee of Canterbury Convocation on the Royal Letters of

The objects aimed at in this proposed rubric, if it should eventually become part of the Book of Common Prayer, or receive sanction as an authorized appendix, appear to have been the following: (1) to allow the Communion of sick persons in some circumstances from the Sacrament consecrated at the Celebration in church; (2) by the provision, "he shall on the same day and with as little delay as may be go and minister the same," to prevent continuous reservation in church;[1] (3) by the provision, "If the consecrated bread and wine be not taken immediately to the sick person, they shall be kept in such

Business (Report no. 487, A.D. 1915), pages 42, 43, and the *Chronicle of Convocation*, A.D. 1915, no. 1, pages 139, 140.

[1] The Bishop of Oxford (Dr. C. Gore), however, seems to consider that this rubric would not prevent permanent reservation in large towns: see his article in *The Oxford Diocesan Magazine*, October, 1915, pages 151, 152.

place and after such manner as the Ordinary shall approve, so that they be not used for any other purpose whatever," to prevent not only services of Exposition and Benediction but also private prayer before the Sacrament; and (4) by the provision "The consecrated bread and wine shall be taken to the sick person in such simple and reverent manner as the Ordinary shall approve" to secure reverent treatment of the Sacrament and at the same time prevent anything of the nature of processions of the Host.

CHAPTER IV

The Use of the Reserved Sacrament for Other Purposes than Communion

IN the early Church and in the early mediaeval Church there were several practices closely connected with the ordinary use for Communion. As now in the East,[1] and on Maundy Thursday in the Church of Rome, the Sacrament was reserved with a view to the Communions made in the Liturgy of the Pre-Sanctified. This may possibly be referred to by the fourth century Council of Laodicea,[2] and is certainly contem-

[1] See page 28, above.

[2] Council of Laodicea (between A.D. 343 and A.D. 381), can. 49, "In Lent it is not allowed to offer bread except on Saturday and Sunday only."

plated by the Council *in Trullo* in A.D. 691.[1] Before the end of the second century a practice had arisen of sending the consecrated Sacrament as a token of intercommunion,[2] a custom which was forbidden two centuries later by the Council of Laodicea.[3] At Rome in the ninth century a fragment of the consecrated species of bread known as the *sancta* was reserved from the Mass of one day and placed in the chalice at the commixture by the Pope on the following day as a symbol of the unity of one Mass with another in regard to time.[4] There is earlier evidence for a similar

[1] Council *in Trullo* (A.D. 391), can. 52, "On all the fast days of the holy Lent except Saturday and Sunday and the holy day of the Annunciation the sacred Liturgy of the Pre-sanctified is to be used."

[2] See St. Irenaeus *apud* Eusebius, *H.E.* v. 24.

[3] Council of Laodicea (between A.D. 343 and A.D. 381), can. 14.

[4] *Ord. Ro.* i. 8, 18.

but different practice.[1] When the Pope did not himself celebrate, he sent a fragment of the consecrated species of bread known as the *fermentum* consecrated by him at a previous Mass to be placed in the chalice like the *sancta* when he himself celebrated. "As the *sancta* demonstrated unity in point of time, so the *fermentum* demonstrated it in point of place."[2] This custom is mentioned by Pope Innocent I in A.D. 416;[3] and passages in the *Liber Pontificalis* which probably date from the sixth century refer to it as having existed in the times of Zephyrinus (Pope A.D. 202-218), Miltiades (Pope A.D. 310–314), and Siricius (Pope A.D. 384–399).[4] "It was a matter of importance in the Roman Church," writes Mgr. Duchesne, "that the ritual

[1] For a clear statement of the difference see E. G. C. F. Atchley, *Ordo Romanus Primus*, pages 106–109.

[2] *Op. cit.* page 108. [3] Innocent I, *Ep.* xxv. 8.

[4] *Lib. Pont.* 16, 33, 40.

of the Communion should contain a clear and striking expression of ecclesiastical unity. Hence the custom of the *fermentum*, that is, of sending consecrated bread from the bishop's Mass to the priests whose duty it was to celebrate in the *tituli*; hence also the significance of the rite of the *sancta*, that is, of putting into the chalice at the *Pax Domini* a fragment consecrated at the preceding Mass and brought forth at the beginning of the present one. Thus, in all the churches at Rome, and at every assembly there for liturgical worship past or present, there was always the same sacrifice, the same Eucharist, the same Communion." [1] By a custom which may have originated in Italy during the eighth century, and is found later in Italy and Gaul and Spain, at the ordination of bishops and presbyters

[1] L. Duchesne, *Christian Worship* (translation of *Origines du culte Chrétien*), chap. vi. § 8, page 185.

each of the newly ordained received a whole portion of the consecrated species of bread of which he consumed a part at the time but kept the rest for subsequent Communions during a period of forty or thirty or seven days.[1]

Besides these practices thus closely connected with the ordinary use of the reserved Sacrament for Communion there have been other customs. In the fourth century in Africa,[2] and in the sixth century in Gaul,[3] it was necessary to forbid the giving of the Eucharist to the dead, by which perhaps the Sacrament was placed on the breast of the dead person, possibly with a view to keeping off evil

[1] See *e.g.* Fulbert of Chartres, *Ep.* iii. (A.D. 1006). Compare I. Morinus, *Comm. de Ordin.* II. pages 277, 278, 281 (edition 1695), III. viii. 2 (4, 7); E. Martene, *De ant. eccl. rit.* I. viii. 9 (20), 10 (21), 11 (Ord. vii, viii).

[2] Council of Hippo (A.D. 393), can. 4; Council of Carthage (A.D. 397), can. 12.

[3] Council of Auxerre (A.D. 578), can. 12.

spirits ; and this prohibition was repeated at the Council *in Trullo* (A.D. 691).[1] It is recorded by St. Gregory the Great of St. Benedict, who died about A.D. 540, that in the case of a boy who had been disobedient and after his sudden death could not rest in his grave he ordered the body of the Lord to be placed on the breast of the boy, and that the body afterwards remained buried.[2] At the consecration of a church a portion of the Eucharist sometimes from the reserved Sacrament, sometimes from the Eucharist then celebrated, was placed in the altar in some countries.[3] This custom appears to have been discontinued in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries.

In addition to the ordinary use of the

[1] Council *in Trullo* (A.D. 691), can. 83.

[2] St. Gregory the Great, *Dial.* ii. 24.

[3] See the *Pontifical of Egbert* (a tenth century copy of an eighth century book), Surtees Society, xxvii. 46 ; Council of Chelsea (A.D. 816), can. 2.

reserved Sacrament for Communion, and apart from such special customs as have been referred to above, four practices have become widely prevalent in a large part of the Church. The practices are Prayer designedly offered before the reserved Sacrament, Processions of the Sacrament, Exposition, and Benediction.

A statement made by Father Herbert Thurston in the year 1908 has been frequently repeated in England during the last few years, not always in the careful language which Father Thurston used. The statement was that "in all the Christian literature of the first thousand years no one has apparently yet found a single clear and definite statement that any person visited a church in order to pray before the body of Christ which was kept upon the altar."[1] Now it is

[1] H. Thurston in his edition of T. E. Bridgett, *A History of the Holy Eucharist in Great Britain*, page 170, note.

unquestionable that there is little evidence of such visits to church during the period of a thousand years which Father Thurston mentions. But in the light of a famous passage in the writings of St. Gregory of Nazianzus it may be doubted whether an instance is wholly absent. Preaching about A.D. 363 St. Gregory, describing the actions of his sister Gorgonia in a time of great illness, says of her, "Despairing of any other help, she betook herself to the Physician of all, and waiting for the dead of night, at a slight intermission of the disease fell before the altar with faith, and, calling on Him who is honoured thereon with a great cry and with every kind of entreaty, and pleading with Him by all His mighty acts accomplished at any time, for she knew both those of ancient and those of later times, at last ventured on an act of pious and splendid boldness; she imitated the woman the foun-

tain of whose blood was dried up by the hem of Christ's garment. What did she do? Placing her head on the altar with another great cry and with a wealth of tears, like one who of old bedewed the feet of Christ, and declaring that she would not let go until she was made well, she then applied to her whole body this medicine which she had, even such a portion of the antitypes of the honourable body and blood [1] as she treasured in her hand, and mingled with this act her tears. O the wonder of it! She went away at once perceiving that she was healed, with the lightness of health in body and soul and mind, having received that for which she hoped as the reward of hope, and having gained

[1] The Greek is τοῦ τιμίου σώματος ἢ τοῦ αἵματος, literally, "the honourable body or blood," but the meaning of the Sacrament generally seems to require in English the translation "honourable body and blood."

strength of body through her strength of soul. These things indeed are great, but they are true." [1] According to Father Thurston's interpretation of this passage, the words "Him who is honoured thereon," that is to say, on the altar, are a general reference to the honour paid to our Lord when the Liturgy is celebrated, and the treasuring of the Sacrament by Gorgonia was a gathering up of remnants which happened to have been left on the altar from the Celebration of the Liturgy. "Gorgonia," he says, "visited the altar as God's resting place, and then put out her hand in the hope of finding some few crumbs or traces of the sacred species, such as would hardly fail to be left where the Liturgy was frequently celebrated." [2] It is always difficult to be sure of the

[1] St. Gregory of Nazianzus, *Orat.* viii. 18.

[2] H. Thurston in *The Journal of Theological Studies*, xi. 275–279.

meaning of an isolated passage; but it is far more probable that Gorgonia went to the altar and took the reserved Sacrament from a receptacle either on it or near it, and, imitating those who in the days of our Lord's mortal life had laid hold of His garment or His feet, touched her body with His Sacrament as a means of miraculous healing than that she looked for and found crumbs of the Sacrament accidentally left there. If so, the passage is an instance of very remarkable recourse to the reserved Sacrament as a means of offering prayer and receiving supernatural help.

In the note in which he questions the existence of "a single clear and definite statement" in the Christian literature of the first thousand years "that any person visited a church in order to pray before the body of Christ which was kept upon the altar" Father Thurston goes on to say, "we do begin to find such

statements by degrees more and more explicitly made from the twelfth and thirteenth centuries onwards." [1] In this later period there is an interesting and significant instance in a book probably written in the early part of the thirteenth century, the *Ancren Riwle*, or rule of the anchoresses or recluses. This book is usually thought to be the work of Bishop Richard Poore, who was Bishop of Chichester from 1214 to 1217, Bishop of Salisbury from 1217 to 1228, and Bishop of Durham from 1228 to 1237, though some writers think that it was written by a member of the Dominican Order.[2] Whoever the author, the

[1] H. Thurston in his edition of T. E. Bridgett, *A History of the Holy Eucharist in Great Britain*, page 170, note.

[2] The reasons for ascribing the book to a Dominican writer are the citation of Dominican prayers and the doubt expressed as to the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin: see pages xi, xii of the essay on *The*

book is not likely to be later than the early part of the thirteenth century. In it the anchoresses are directed what devotions to use when first rising and while dressing ; it then proceeds, " When ye are quite dressed, sprinkle yourselves with holy water, which ye should have always with you, and think upon God's flesh, and on His blood, which is over the high altar, and fall on your knees toward it, with this salutation, ' Hail, Thou Author of our creation ! Hail, Thou Price of our redemption ! Hail, Thou who art our Support during our pilgrimage ! Hail, O Reward of our expectation ! '

Be Thou our joy,
Who art to be our meed,
Our glory be in Thee,
Through endless time.
Abide with us, O Lord !

Spiritual Life of Mediaeval England by the Rev. J. B. Dalgairns prefixed to his edition of Walter Hilton's *The Scale of Perfection.*

Remove dark night;
Wash off all guilt;
Grant godly balm.
Glory to Thee, O Lord,
Thou Virgin's Son.

Thus shall you do also when the priest elevates it at the Mass, and before the confession, when you are about to receive the Host." [1]

What is important here to notice is that the devotions addressed to our Lord in the reserved Sacrament are the same as those addressed to Him at the elevation of the Host and before Communion.

Through the later middle ages the practice of addressing prayer to our Lord in the reserved Sacrament was in-

[1] The above quotation is from pages 13, 14 of the edition of the *Ancren Riwle* by Abbot Gasquet in the series "The King's Classics," which to a large extent follows the modernized form which together with the semi-Saxon original was published for the Camden Society by the Rev. James Morton in 1853.

herited by those Christians who in the sixteenth and following centuries remained in external communion with the Pope; increased importance appears to have been attached to it in the devotional movements which formed part of the Counter-Reformation; and in many parts of Western Christendom today it is widely prevalent and highly valued. The Eastern method of hiding the altar, on which the Sacrament is reserved, by the screen and the holy doors has been a factor in preventing the prevalence of any such practice in the East.

The evidence for Processions of the Sacrament in the ordinary sense begins with the years from 1070 to 1089, during which Lanfranc was Archbishop of Canterbury. He had previously been prior of Bec and Abbot of St. Stephen's, Caen, in Normandy, and it is possible that the processions for which he made provision

at Canterbury may have been used in one or both of these places. In his statutes for Canterbury Cathedral there are very full directions for the procession on Palm Sunday. A shrine containing the Sacrament is placed in the choir a little before daybreak. At the time of the procession before the Mass a station is made; two priests carry the shrine through the station and round the church; all present genuflect as the shrine passes them; the shrine is brought back to the choir and placed on a table at the gates.[1] In the same statutes there are instructions that on Maundy Thursday after Mass the body of the Lord is to be taken to a beautifully adorned place, and that on Good Friday it is to be brought to the high altar amid the adoration of all the brethren.[2] A procession with the Sacrament on

[1] Lanfranc, *Decreta pro ord. S. Benedicti*, i. 4.
[2] *Op. cit.* i. 4.

Palm Sunday is ordered also in the *Ordinarium* ascribed to John, Archbishop of Rouen,[1] who died in A.D. 1079, the date of which however is doubtful. The Canterbury statutes of Lanfranc were adopted at St. Albans by the Abbot Paul,[2] the first abbot after the Norman Conquest, and it is likely that among other usages the Palm Sunday procession with the Sacrament took place there as well as at Canterbury, and there is evidence that it was in use at St. Albans during the time of the Abbot Simon, who was abbot from 1166 to 1183.[3] This procession with the Sacrament on Palm Sunday is mentioned also among the Sarum customs of the thirteenth century,[4] in the fourteenth century *Here-*

[1] *Ordinarium Canonicorum Regularium S. Laudi Rotomagensis* (*P.L.* cxlvii. 167, 168).

[2] *Gesta Abb. S. Alb.* i. 52, 61.

[3] *Op. cit.* i. 190–192.

[4] See the MS. in the Bodleian Library, Rawl. MS. c. 892, fo. 44a, 46b. Compare the *Sarum*

ford Missal,[1] and in the *Sarum Missal* and *Processional*.[2] There is evidence from the first half of the fourteenth century for a procession with the Sacrament on Ascension Day at St. Augustine's Abbey, Canterbury;[3] and there is fifteenth century evidence for the carrying of the Sacrament in procession on the feast of Corpus Christi.[4] The *Roman*

Consuetudinary in W. H. Frere, *The Use of Sarum*, i. 59–61.

[1] See W. G. Henderson, *Missale ad usum percelebris ecclesiæ Herefordensis*, pages 79–81.

[2] See F. H. Dickinson, *Missale ad usum insignis et præclaræ ecclesiæ Sarum*, columns 258–262, 332, 333. Compare W. H. Frere, *The Use of Sarum*, i. 153.

[3] See E. M. Thompson, *Customary of the Benedictine Monasteries of Saint Augustine, Canterbury, and Saint Peter, Westminster*, i. 115, ii. 285.

[4] See the Bulls of Pope Martin V (A.D. 1429), and Pope Eugenius IV (A.D. 1433), the Letter of the Council of Basle (A.D. 1434), and the Statutes of the Provincial Council of Cologne (A.D. 1452) (A. Cherubini, *Magnum Bullarium Romanum*, i. 328, 342; J. Hardouin, *Concilia*, viii. 1489–1491, ix. 1368).

Ritual now in use gives instructions for the procession with the Sacrament on the feast of Corpus Christi and on other occasions.

The Council of Trent anathematized "any who say that in the holy Sacrament of the Eucharist Christ the only-begotten Son of God ought not to be adored with the worship of divine adoration (*cultu latriae*) even externally, and . . . therefore He ought not to be carried round in processions according to the praiseworthy and universal custom of the holy Church, or that He ought not to be set forth publicly to the people that He may be adored, and that those who worship Him are idolaters," as well as those who denied that the Eucharist might lawfully be reserved and carried with honour to the sick.[1] Except for the widely different custom of the Great Entrance with the Consecrated Gifts brought from

[1] Council of Trent, Sess. xiii. can. 6, 7.

the prothesis through the north door and aisle to the holy doors and through them to the altar in the Liturgy of the Pre-sanctified there are no processions with the Sacrament in the East.

The placing of the shrine containing the Blessed Sacrament at the entrance of the choir at the close of the Palm Sunday procession already mentioned as directed in the statutes of Archbishop Lanfranc for Canterbury Cathedral is an early instance of an approach to Exposition. The transparent monstrances used in Germany in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, sometimes placed within the lattice work of the great Sacrament Houses, may have been due to a desire on the part of devout persons to pray not only before the Sacrament but also with the Sacrament shown to them.[1] During the fifteenth and sixteenth cen-

[1] See H. Thurston in *The Catholic Encyclopædia*, v. 713, 714.

turies many councils passed decrees restricting Exposition, as well as Processions of the Sacrament, to such occasions as the feast of Corpus Christi, times of special trouble, and days specially permitted by the authorities.[1] The most remarkable form of Exposition is in the devotion known as the *Quarant' Ore* or "Forty Hours' Prayer." This devotion appears to have originated in Milan in the sixteenth century, and to have been promoted by St. Philip Neri at Rome and by St. Ignatius Loyola.[2] Without express mention of Exposition, but probably implying it, the continuous observance of the Forty Hours' Prayer by an arranged succession of churches and times was redered at Rome in A.D.

[1] See, *e.g.*, the statutes of the Council of Cologne (A.D. 1452).

[2] See H. Thurston in *The Catholic Encyclopædia*, vi. 151–153. Compare K. A. H. Kellner, *Heortology*, page 125 (English translation).

1592 by Pope Clement VIII as a means of prayer "for the Holy Catholic Church that errors may be overthrown and the truth of the one faith promoted in the whole world," for the conversion of sinners, for the peace and unity of kings and Christians, for France in its affliction and for its return to ancient devotion and former quietness, that the Turks the enemies of the faith may be overthrown, and for the Pope himself that he may be so strengthened and helped by God that together with the flock he may "attain to eternal life through the sprinkling of the blood of the immaculate Lamb." [1] Exposition, whether for the Forty Hours' Prayer or for shorter periods, has become an ordinary practice in the Church of Rome with elaborate rules designed to prevent

[1] Clement VIII, *Institutio Orat. Quad.* 2, dated November 25, 1592. See A. Cherubini, *Magnum Bullarium Romanum*, iii. 22.

abuses. The different way of treating the reserved Sacrament in the East has prevented any such method of prayer in the Eastern Church.

It is probable that Benediction with the Blessed Sacrament as a formal ceremony is not older than at the earliest the second half of the sixteenth century. The distinctive feature of it is that, after the exposition of the Sacrament and the singing of hymns or litanies before it, the priest takes into his hands the monstrance in which the Sacrament is exposed, and makes the sign of the cross with it in silence over the congregation as a means of blessing with the Sacrament. It is not unlikely that the origin of it was at first incidental, that the priest at the end of a procession with the Sacrament blessed the people with the Sacrament before placing it in the tabernacle or other receptacle—a practice afterwards explicitly ordered at the end

of all such processions—and that the custom of doing this gradually spread; and that the act thus in the first instance the close of a procession came sometimes to be practised as a separate service. The association of singing particular devotions, especially some addressed to the Blessed Virgin, may perhaps be due to the combination of evening guild devotions sung before a statue of our Lady in the middle ages with the ceremony of Exposition.[1] Jean Baptiste Thiers in his *Traité de l'exposition du saint sacrement de l'autel*, which was first published in 1673, writes that he thinks the custom of blessing the people with the Sacrament before replacing it in the tabernacle to be of recent origin, since he has "not found

[1] See H. Thurston, in *The Catholic Encyclopædia*, ii. 465, 466, and in the *Report of the Nineteenth Eucharistic Conference held at Westminster from 9th to 13th September*, 1908, pages 452–464.

any *Ritual* or *Ceremonial* more than one hundred years old which makes mention of it." [1] The authorities which he records as ordering the blessing with the Sacrament at the end of the procession on Corpus Christi are the *Ritual* of Perouze of the year 1597, the *Roman Ritual* of Pope Paul V, who was Pope from 1605 to 1621, the *Roman Ritual* for the use of the diocese of St. Malo printed at St. Malo in 1617, Piscara's *Pratique des Cérémonies Ecclésiastiques,* and de la Croix's *Le Parfait Ecclésiastique.*[2] During the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries Benediction as a formal service appears to have gradually become more frequent in France and other places.[3] In the nineteenth and early twentieth

[1] J. B. Thiers, *Traité de l'exposition du saint sacrement,* livre v, chap. 7 (page 752, edition of 1679).

[2] *Op. cit.* livre iii, chap. 7 (pages 404–406).

[3] See H. Thurston, *op. cit.*

centuries it has been customary among Roman Catholics in most countries, perhaps least in Spain, and most in France and Italy. Benediction like Exposition is not found in the Eastern Church.

CHAPTER V

Doctrinal and Practical Considerations

THE foregoing sketch of historical facts concerning the reserved Sacrament brings out wide differences in the practices of different places and different times. From it one point clearly emerges. Reservation for the Communion of the sick can claim very high support from the history of the Church. The earliest evidence indicates that in the first ages of the Church the sick normally received their Communion from the Sacrament consecrated in the public service, not from a Celebration in their homes. The common tradition of

West and East through many centuries has been for the sick to receive Communion from the reserved Sacrament. In the mediæval English Church the practice was the same. It is the usage still in operation among Eastern Christians and in the Church of Rome. It is the existing traditional custom of the Scottish Church, a Church in full communion with the Church of England and frequently using the English Prayer Book as well as its own Liturgy.

Those who know the Church of Scotland tell us how highly the privilege of Communion from the reserved Sacrament is valued. In 1899 the then Bishop of Aberdeen and Orkney (Dr. Arthur Gascoigne Douglas) wrote, " It is a subject of heart-felt thankfulness to me to know that on every recurring great festival the blessed Eucharist of that festival is being carried by good and faithful clergy over hill and dale in this diocese of

Aberdeen, and across the seas in Orkney and Shetland, to every sick and infirm member of the Church." [1] Parish priests in England tell the same tale. They bear witness that for lack of the reserved Sacrament, where it is not reserved, Communion is not given or is given with great difficulty to those who should receive it ; and that, where it is reserved, that part of their ministry which concerns the sick can be far more efficiently performed. There are indeed some sick and infirm persons to whom there is spiritual profit in being present at the Celebration in their own houses as well as in receiving Communion. Keble's words :

I came again : the place was bright
"With something of celestial light"—
A simple altar by the bed
For high Communion meetly spread,

[1] See the preface written by Bishop Douglas to the book by Mr. F. C. Eeles, *Reservation of the Holy Eucharist in the Scottish Church*

Chalice and plate, and snowy vest.
We ate and drank: then calmly blest,
All mourners, one with dying breath,
We sate and talk'd of Jesus' death [1]—

have not altogether lost their force. But in a vast number of instances the comfort for those seriously ill or dying is great if without the strain of the Celebration they can quietly and quickly make their Communion.

Both for the greater comfort of those who in any case would be able to receive Communion and to make Communion possible in cases in which it would otherwise be impossible there is great need of the reserved Sacrament in English churches. The possession of it may often help the fulfilment of the strong desire of the Christian society that its members may have the consolation and power of the Eucharist in their dying

[1] J. Keble, *The Christian Year*, "Visitation and Communion of the Sick."

moments, a desire so strong in the early days of the Church that the First Œcumenical Council made careful provision in accordance with inherited usage to prevent those who being under penitential discipline had not yet fulfilled their penance from being deprived of Communion before death, and with a still more generous instinct enlarged the customary bounds of indulgence so as to allow Communion to all dying members of the Church who in a right spirit should ask for it. For to the decree evidently referring to those still under discipline, "Concerning those who are departing from this life the old and regular law shall still as heretofore be observed, so that if any is departing he shall not be deprived of the last and most necessary Viaticum," there is added the more general precept, "But generally also in the case of every person whatsoever departing this life who asks to receive

the Eucharist let the bishop test his fitness and administer it." [1]

There is nothing in any true doctrine about the Eucharist which ought to cause hesitation to administer or receive Communion from the reserved Sacrament. For the consecration once effected is permanent. In the sacred rite of the Church the bread and wine offered and consecrated are the body and blood of the Lord. The lapse of time between their consecration at the altar and the reception of them later in the day or some days after does not change them. By receiving them the communicant in his own house receives the same gift as he would have received if he had knelt at the altar in the course of the Celebration. When a contrary view sprang up

[1] Council of Nicæa (A.D. 325), can. 13. See W. Bright, *The Canons of the First Four General Councils*, pages 50–55; C. J. Hefele, *History of the Councils, in loco*.

in some quarters in the fifth century it was characterized in fitting terms by St. Cyril of Alexandria. "I hear," he wrote to Calosyrius, the Bishop of Arsinoe, "they say that the sacramental consecration does not avail for hallowing if a portion of it be kept for another day. In saying so they are mad. For Christ is not altered nor will His holy body be changed; but the power of the consecration and the life-giving grace are permanent in it." [1]

On May 1, 1900, Dr. Frederick Temple, then Archbishop of Canterbury, delivered at Lambeth Palace an opinion in regard to reservation. He distinguished three distinct forms: first, "the practice to treat sick persons, who are not in the church but are living close by, as if they were part of the congregation, and at the time of administration to the communi-

[1] St. Cyril of Alexandria, *Ep. ad Calosyr.* (Aubert, vi (2). 365).

cants generally to take the elements out of the church to them as well as to those who are actually present"; secondly, "instead of consuming all that remains of the consecrated elements as the rubric directs to keep a portion back and to administer this portion to people known to be sick at some later period of the day"; and thirdly, "the elements after consecration are sometimes reserved not only to be used for those who are known to be sick at the time, but to be used for any case of sudden emergency which may occasion a demand for the Sacrament in the course of the week."[1] With respect to all three methods, the Archbishop affirmed that "such a practice was quite consistent with the Christian faith, and there was nothing in it that was wrong in itself."[2] But, while thus

[1] *The Archbishop of Canterbury on Reservation of the Sacrament*, pages 5, 6.

[2] *Op. cit.* pages 6, 7.

declaring the innocence of reservation in itself, he was no less emphatic that it is not allowed in the Church of England. "The canon," he said, "requires that every clergyman shall promise that, in the administration of the Sacraments, he will use the form prescribed in the Prayer Book and none other, except so far as shall be otherwise ordered by lawful authority. And, on examining the Prayer Book, we do not find any single mention of, or allusion to, the practice of reservation except in the close of the twenty-eighth Article, where it is said that the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper was not by Christ's ordinance reserved, carried about, lifted up, or worshipped. It will obviously require overwhelming evidence to prove that reservation in any sense whatever is part of the form prescribed in the Book of Common Prayer"; [1] "The Book of Common

[1] *Op. cit.* page 6.

Prayer contains no order, and provides no opportunity for the practice of reservation. The language of the twenty-eighth Article cannot be taken otherwise than as condemning the practice altogether. To say that the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper was not by Christ's ordinance reserved, carried about, lifted up, or worshipped, is to say that those who do these things use for one purpose what our Lord ordained for another." [1] "After weighing carefully all that has been put before us, I am obliged to decide that the Church of England does not at present allow reservation in any form, and that those who think it ought to be allowed, though perfectly justified in endeavouring to get the proper authorities to alter the law, are not justified in practising reservation until the law has been altered." [2]

[1] *Op. cit.* page 8.

[2] *Op. cit.* page 12. Compare with this utterance

If Archbishop Temple's conclusion is wholly accepted, then it is certainly the urgent duty of those who believe that reservation is theologically innocent and practically expedient to do all in their power " to get the proper authorities to alter the law." But there are some reasons for questioning the conclusion which the Archbishop with characteristic candour expressed. On the supposition which he took as the basis of his argument, namely, that reservation is not allowed in the Church of England unless it is explicitly ordered in the Prayer Book, it was hardly possible for him to reach any other conclusion than that which he expressed. But it is not clear that he was right in this fundamental supposition. The constitution of Arch-

of Archbishop Temple the similar opinion by Archbishop W. D. Maclagan of York on the same day in *Archbishop of York on Reservation of Sacrament.*

bishop Peccham directing reservation in every parish church,[1] however its operation may have been affected by many enactments in the Church legislation of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, has never been expressly repealed; and it is not easy to say what bearing the more recent provisions and the general course of events in the Church of England have on its central point.[2] The maxim that omission is not necessarily prohibition is of considerable force in regard to the Prayer Book. The directions in the Latin Prayer Book of 1560,[3] the practice of the Scottish Church,[4] such opinions as those of Thorndike,[5]

[1] See page 24, above.

[2] Compare T. A. Lacey, *Reservation*, page 11, "The abrogation of law, written or unwritten, by desuetude, is a matter for highly technical investigation, and he would be a rash man who should hastily declare himself in such a cause."

[3] See page 31, above. [4] See pages 35-37, above.

[5] See pages 44, 45, above.

all of them points left wholly unnoticed by Archbishop Temple, may suggest that the provision of the office for the Communion of the sick by means of a Celebration in the sick person's house does not of necessity show that no other method of communicating the sick is lawful. The act of reserving the Sacrament may well be regarded as part of the ordinary method by which the parish priest secures that he can give Communion to those who need it, so that reservation in a parish church, as distinct from a private chapel, for reservation in which leave certainly is required, does not require any direction or sanction from the bishop. In very many parishes the Sacrament has been reserved with the knowledge and without the interference, or with the actual permission, of the bishop for years past. All these are considerations which tend to suggest that Archbishop Temple judged the

whole matter on too narrow a basis; and that the regard and reverence which English Churchmen rightly have for him need not hold them back from questioning the conclusion which he reached.

If the Sacrament is reserved, there are practical and devotional inferences which follow. There must be a reverent method of reservation. There must be due care about the custody and renewal of the Sacrament. Those who enter the place where the Sacrament is reserved are called to acts of worship. He Who is there present is the divine Lord Who was born of Mary and baptized and tempted, Who taught and healed and suffered, Who died and rose and ascended, Who is now at the right hand of the Father. All that He can claim of human love and adoration is due to Him in His sacramental presence. The worship which the Christian soul pays to Him when the Sacrament is consecrated is paid also

as it is reserved. It includes the utmost response of which the soul is capable. If it differs at all from the worship which would be His if He were to manifest His visible presence, the difference is not because of anything in Him but only because the soul might attain to something higher if the sight of the Lord were vouchsafed.

It has been said that those who enter the place where the Sacrament is reserved are called to acts of worship. It is greatly to be desired that this place may be one from which faithful Church people are not ordinarily excluded. The practice of the Eastern Church [1] is frequently cited as supplying an argument in a different direction. The Eastern Church has its own great claims to appreciative regard. It has theologians of mark. It has much splendour of worship. It has continued to keep a hold on the

[1] See page 65, above.

devotion of vast multitudes. It has entered in marvellous fashion into their lives. Those who have worshipped in the great cathedrals of Petrograd, or in the ancient shrines and in the new church at Moscow, may well have been profoundly impressed by those services in which they have taken part. But nevertheless on entering such churches they may have felt something lacking which is familiar in other parts of Europe. They may have quite deliberately made up their minds that the reverence shown by multitudes in the Eastern churches to the eikons and the intense remembrance of the saints, wonderful as these are, supply but a poor substitute for that adoration of our Lord and that prayer to Him in the Sacrament which are found in the West. And if one goes behind the screen, it is a shock to realize that the Lord is resting there without the worship of His creatures. Many

must have felt on entering some humble Western church in a mean street with one or two from the poorest of the poor worshipping our Lord as they kneel before the tabernacle that here is something which the most gorgeous temples of the East are failing to give.

It is true that there is an opportunity for worshipping our Lord in His sacramental presence at the Celebration of the Eucharist. The reality and the greatness of that opportunity do not make unreasonable an intense desire for approach to Him in the Sacrament at other times. While the Lord's presence on the altar at the consecration calls for the most profound worship of which those who are in the church are capable, yet at the moment their attendance is not primarily for the purpose of adoring Him but for the acts of sacrifice and Communion. And, though He abides with a lasting gift in those who have

partaken of Him in Communion. His sacramental presence at the altar during the Celebration is for a few minutes only.

The permission of approach to the place where the Sacrament is reserved may not be abruptly refused on the ground of primitive usage and because it is a development. There are developments of different kinds. In doctrine the permanent existence of unchanging truths does not rightly hinder the development of new forms of expression, of inferences always implicit but not always expressed, of conclusions not at the first seen. He was not a faithful upholder of divinely revealed truth but a helper of intruding heresy who in the Arian controversies of the fourth century refused to apply to God the Son the term " of the same essence as the Father " because it was not Scriptural and had not been used by the primitive Church. He again was denying the original faith

and promoting error who would not assent to the Church's definitions about our Lord's Person in the fifth century because they had not been explicitly made in apostolic days. In matters of practice the Church has made great differences of method from those of the earliest times. The public confession and reconciliation of penitents has become a private rite. We do not think it necessary that men and women should be divested of all their clothing before Baptism because this was the ancient custom. Few in the Church of England would maintain that there may not be more than one altar in one church, or more than one Celebration on the same day on the same altar. And certainly the mere appeal to the usage of early centuries cannot be made consistently in a religious society the members of which are encouraged to kneel on the Lord's Day, and in which Confirmation and

Communion are refused to infants and young children.[1]

The question then is not whether admission to the place where the Sacrament is reserved is a development but whether it is a true and right or a false and wrong development. In an attempt to decide this point in regard to any practice there are several questions to be asked. First, is there anything in the practice which is contrary to revealed truth, Church principle, or the requirements of Christian life? Secondly, is the lawfulness of it a right inference from true doctrine? Thirdly, does it tend to protect and promote the truth or to weaken and destroy it? Fourthly, is it profitable to spiritual life? Obviously, in the particular matter here considered

[1] Opinions may differ as to whether the Church of England has been right or wrong in departing from primitive custom in these matters; but whatever opinions may be held as to this, the fact of the departure is unquestionable.

the answer to the first three questions will to a large extent depend on what the true doctrine of the Holy Eucharist is. The Protestant divines of the sixteenth century had their clear answer to all such questions. The adoration of our Lord in the reserved Sacrament, like the adoration at the consecration in the Mass, was idolatry; those who took part in it were idolaters.[1] From their own point of view they were perfectly right. If the consecrated elements are only bread and wine after consecration as before, whatever gifts or virtues may be attached to the profitable reception

[1] See, *e.g.*, T. Cranmer, *An Answer unto a crafty and sophistical Cavillation*, page 238 (Parker Society's edition), Letter to J. Calvin, March 20, 1552, in Parker Society's *Original Letters relative to the English Reformation*, i. 24; J. Bradford, *A Sermon of the Lord's Supper*, page 88 (Parker Society's edition). Even R. Field, writing when the pressure of controversy was less severe, uses like language about processions of the Sacrament: see his *Of the Church*, Book III, chapter xxxiv.

of them, those who imagine that they are worshipping our Lord are wholly wrong in seeking the object of their adoration in His presence in the Sacrament. But, if it is true that by consecration the bread and wine become His body and blood, if our Lord Himself, eternal God, very Man glorified, spiritual, risen, ascended, is present in the Sacrament, then in the adoration there is no idolatry but rather the worship which is the bounden duty of a Christian. That opportunity should be afforded for thus worshipping our Lord is certainly not contrary to revealed truth, or to Church principle, or to any requirement of Christian life. The right inference from the doctrine would seem to be rather the promotion of such worship than the discouragement of it. Belief in the reality of our Lord's presence is protected and promoted rather than weakened or destroyed by it. The fourth question,

whether it is profitable to spiritual life, is perhaps more difficult to answer. It is no easy task to estimate the hidden workings of the spirit of man. But there are two things that may be said, and each of them is weighty. Many have in fact found it lead to the growth of more fervent devotion and to be a means of promoting a closer spiritual union with our Lord. And, whatever cries for reform in some matters may be heard within the Roman communion, it does not seem to be suggested by any who there have the widest possible experience that it would be for the good of souls that the reserved Sacrament should be put in an inaccessible place. The present writer has heard many assert the danger of devotion before the reserved Sacrament, and many assert its spiritual profit; and he has noticed that those who condemn the practice have had least experience of it, while

those who have really used it maintain its value.

There is much to be said in favour of the place accessible to worshippers being secluded and quiet. From this point of view admirable arrangements have been made in some English churches. In one church there is a side chapel somewhat out of sight from the main entrance of the church. In another there is a crypt chapel approached from the church by a flight of steps. In another there is a chapel reached by steps ascending from the church. By such arrangements, when the door of the chapel is kept unlocked and the fact of reservation is known, there is at once protection to the sacred presence of our Lord and accessibility for those who will use it well. The way is open, and yet is for those who seek it. To the mind of the present writer these considerations are of great weight. Great dangers of irrev-

erence which will exist until belief in the Eucharistic presence is more widely prevalent in England and in the English Church may thus often be avoided. But it cannot be denied that there is something to be said for a different method by which the reserved Sacrament may be a prominent feature in the church, and proclaimed in the most public way. By those who advocate such a use it is said that here is the method of the Incarnation. In His mortal life on earth our Blessed Lord exposed Himself to all possibilities of insult, He braved all the risks of the crowd. There are those who think that He would not desire less generosity in his sacramental presence than in His manifested earthly life.

So far the devotions considered in this chapter have only been those in the private prayers of individuals. Services of Exposition and Benediction are on a

different footing in the respect that for them as public services the permission, or at least the allowance, of the bishop of the diocese is required. But the question must be discussed whether, supposing some kind of episcopal sanction, they are in themselves desirable. Exposition has never possessed for the present writer the attraction which many find in it. To his mind and in his prayer it is very difficult to make any distinction between what is called for and may be given when the Sacrament is in the tabernacle and when it is placed outside it. The simple Exposition of the Sacrament without any public service and common worship does not seem to him to add anything to the fact of reservation; to him personally there is no spiritual gain in being able to see the Sacrament in addition to knowing that it is there. Since this is so, there does not seem to him to be any special reason for opening

the tabernacle door or placing the Sacrament outside the tabernacle. On the other hand, he does not see any weighty reason against it. And the question whether to private prayers there may be added common devotions is rather a matter of expediency than of principle. It would be difficult to maintain an essential difference between the spiritual acts of a number of individuals and those of a congregation. Granting episcopal sanction, the lawfulness of a service of Exposition appears to follow from a commendation of private prayers in the presence of the reserved Sacrament.

What then is to be said about Benediction with the Sacrament? In this service a marked step is taken additional to anything which is found in Exposition and in the parts of Processions of the Sacrament before the blessing at the end. In Exposition and in Processions there is an invitation to adore our Lord, and

opportunity is provided for prayer to Him. When there is Benediction with the Sacrament, in addition to this invitation and opportunity, a blessing is given with the Sacrament. The exact force and distinctive gift in such a blessing is difficult to define. Theologians appear to have shrunk from writing about it. Well known Roman Catholic books say little as to its meaning. The whole statement about it in one excellent manual is characterized rather by caution than by explanation: "Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament," says Bishop Hedley, "the most popular of modern devotion, is connected with antiquity at three points. First, we have in this act of devotion a survival of those 'salutations' or 'praises' of our Lady, which were so common in the later middle ages. It was natural, when the Blessed Sacrament was brought out of its reverential hiddenness, to gather

around it with hymns and canticles. At first, no doubt, it was not exposed in the same way that we now expose it in the monstrance. But just as Exposition gradually became an essential part of the Forty Hours' intercession, so it became a part of those devout 'salutations.' The blessing of the people with the Sacrament can be traced to the beginning of the sixteenth century. It is specifically mentioned in the Instructions of St. Charles Borromeo, but must have been in use much earlier. It is confessed, however, by the learned that there is almost a complete absence of evidence as to when the practice of Benediction began. It is really a combination of 'salutation,' Exposition, and the blessing, which from the beginning even to the present day, although there are rules which must be observed, has depended to a very great extent on the devotion and taste of a particular

country or diocese."[1] And another manual in explaining the purposes of processions says nothing at all about the force of the blessing at the end of a Procession which is the distinctive feature in the service of Benediction. "The Processions of the Blessed Sacrament," wrote the Belgian Jesuit Father Schouppe, "are especially intended (1) to celebrate the victories of Jesus Christ over heretics and impious men who have assailed this mystery; (2) to repair the outrages which have been committed against this Sacrament of love; (3) to make public profession of our faith in His real presence; (4) to obtain His blessings on all the places and parishes through which He is carried in triumph."[2] But, while the present writer finds it difficult

[1] Bishop J. C. Hedley, *The Holy Eucharist*, pages 270, 271.

[2] F. X. Schouppe, *Abridged Manual of Religious Instruction*, page 404 (English translation).

to understand the particular value of the blessing with the Sacrament as distinct from that in Exposition and Processions, he would most earnestly protest against the notion which is sometimes expressed that there is objection to it on doctrinal grounds. When the report of the Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline issued in 1906 described "Reservation of the Sacrament under conditions which lead to its adoration," "Corpus Christi Processions with the Sacrament," and "Benediction with the Sacrament" as "clearly inconsistent with and subversive of the teaching of the Church of England," [1] the Commissioners maintained a position which could be defended only on the supposition that the Church of England is committed to the denial of the Catholic

[1] *Report of the Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline*, sections 397, 398.

doctrine of the Eucharist. For those who are accepting that doctrine, if there is to be objection to Benediction, it must be in a different sphere.

Prayer before the reserved Sacrament, Exposition, Processions of the Sacrament, Benediction, are all Western, not Eastern. To a considerable extent they owe their prevalence in the Church of Rome to the great religious movement known as the Counter-Reformation. Neither of these facts excludes them from needing the most careful consideration from English Church people and from the English episcopate. The Church of England is in many respects characteristically Western, and could not approximate to Eastern methods without much reversal of its history and condition. And the Church of England, at least very many of its members, and with great spiritual profit, has already adopted much that is largely due to the

Counter-Reformation. Missions, Retreats, the Three Hours' Service on Good Friday, devotional practice and language are largely thence derived. Where East and West differ, the West may be right; certainly in the Counter-Reformation very much was good.

A prelate of the English Church, Dr. Frank Weston, the Bishop of Zanzibar, has written some thoughtful words on the use of the Blessed Sacrament. "It is therefore," he says, "both interesting and profitable to notice the varying stress laid upon the greatest of all Sacraments in the different districts of the Catholic Church. The East has steadily developed her devotion to our Lord as He is expressed, and His presence extended in His mystical body, and has placed the invocation of saints in the very forefront of her devotional approach to God. While the Blessed Sacrament is left where the primitive

Church apparently placed Him, as the necessary centre of the Holy Unbloody Sacrifice, and the necessary preparation for Communion, but in no way at all as the object of worship outside Mass. She has quite evidently developed her reverence for saints, and her whole hearted worship of Christ in the saints; she has, however, not developed extra-liturgical worship of Christ in the Blessed Sacrament. That is to say, she has laid the greater stress on the Christ in the members of His mystical body. The Latin Church, on the other hand, has developed two great devotions. She has seized eagerly upon the truth of the Blessed Sacrament as symbol of a real measure of Transcendence of the Christ over the body that He indwells; and has thereby beyond question deepened her children's desire for His presence within them, frequency of Communion accompanying this new devotion to Him

in His own Sacrament. While the devotion to Christ in the members of His mystical body she developed in common with the East, but in later centuries she has quite distinctly tended to a practical regard for the saints as in some way constituting a separate community within the Church and yet as it were set over against the rest of the Church, as also over against Christ Himself; so that they act as mediators between the visible Church and the Christ rather than as agents of Christ's intercession at once for and through the Church and all her members. . . . In those districts of the Church that are named after the Metropolitan of Canterbury the whole tendency has for long been away from both the Eastern and Latin paths of development. The movements of thought in England in the eighteenth and first half of the nineteenth centuries were in a direction quite opposite to devotion to our Lord

Jesus Christ whether in Blessed Sacrament or in mystical body. The whole atmosphere was chilly and cold; and the typical orthodox teaching appears to have laid more emphasis upon the atoning Saviour as He is divine Person than upon His incarnate presence extended in our midst. So that the revivals of personal religion, Evangelical and Tractarian, naturally followed along such paths as had become habitual to the various reformers. And it was comparatively late in the nineteenth century that any large body of Churchmen claimed to develop devotion to the Blessed Sacrament outside Communion and to the saints; nor was their claim allowed easily by some of the greatest of those who had taught them all else that they knew. It was thought that, at its very best, these were as it were luxuries and 'extras,' hardly to be approved; and in official circles the

matter so stands to-day. Whereas the truth is that the mystical body must necessarily have deepened down the ages her sense of her Lord's presence within her and about her; and as she came to a clearer apprehension of it and its twofold mode, she naturally began to value these expressions of Him more than in the past. And there is every sign that English Churchmen, since they have recovered belief in that presence under its two modes, are determined to express themselves towards Jesus in the Blessed Sacrament as do the Latins, and towards Jesus in the saints as do the Easterns. How far the official Church in England will venture in an ill-advised attempt to stem this development we do not know, nor do we care to guess. For where Jesus is with souls hungry for His knowledge and His Love, the Holy Spirit will always find a way. Our prayer is that the English bishops will

not make one law of devotion for all souls alike, but will rather gladly permit what great provinces of the Church approve, lest haply they be found to have closed a path along which the Lord Jesus had desired to meet not a few of His children." [1]

Another English divine, Dr. Arthur Chandler, the Bishop of Bloemfontein, has lately written, "In addition to its primary function of providing for the Communion of the sick, the reserved Sacrament has a wonderful power of attracting and focussing the prayers and devotions of the faithful. In the midst of the turmoil and the hurry and the distractions of life, in the midst of its sorrows and sins, the divine presence makes itself felt, tranquil and strong; a light ever shining through gross darkness; drawing in the weary and the

[1] Bishop F. Weston, *The Fulness of Christ*, pages 262–266.

tempted; infusing into them a new mysterious peace and power; sending them back with fresh courage to face the world; encouraging them to claim that chosen and more intimate fellowship which is the privilege of the communicant." [1]

The Bishop of Zanzibar's "prayer is that the English bishops will not make one law of devotion for all souls alike." Here perhaps the solution of many difficulties may be found. Of necessity the Church of England's history and position make its actions tentative. That fact should not lessen the courage and the right freedom of its authorities. The reservation of the Sacrament and the approach of Christians to it in private prayer do not appear to require in parish churches positive episcopal sanction. With carefully guarded regulations the

[1] Bishop A. Chandler, *The English Church and Reunion*, pages 182, 183.

needed episcopal sanction for services of Exposition and Benediction might well be given in those cases in which there is a genuine demand for them on the part of clergy and people. And the welfare of the Church of England, in view of its past history and present state, may rightly be sought in an ample toleration widely extended in different directions towards those who, though they differ greatly in many matters of opinion and practice, agree in accepting the truths of the Incarnation and in the reception of sacramental grace.

Appendix

MOST IMPORTANT PASSAGES REFERRED TO PAGE 12.

St. Justin Martyr, *Apol.* i. 65.

Ἔπειτα προσφέρεται τῷ προεστῶτι τῶν ἀδελφῶν ἄρτος καὶ ποτήριον ὕδατος καὶ κράματος, καὶ οὗτος λαβὼν αἶνον καὶ δόξαν τῷ πατρὶ τῶν ὅλων διὰ τοῦ ὀνόματος τοῦ υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ ἁγίου ἀναπέμπει καὶ εὐχαριστίαν ὑπὲρ τοῦ κατηξιῶσθαι τούτων παρ' αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ πολὺ ποιεῖται· οὗ συντελέσαντος τὰς εὐχὰς καὶ τὴν εὐχαριστίαν πᾶς ὁ παρὼν λαὸς ἐπευφημεῖ λέγων, Ἀμήν.

Τὸ δὲ ἀμὴν τῇ Ἑβραΐδι φωνῇ τὸ γένοιτο σημαί-

Then are brought to the president of the brethren bread and a cup of water and wine. And he receives these, and sends up praise and glory to the Father of all things through the name of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, and he gives Thanks at length for our having been vouchsafed these things by him. And, when he has finished the prayers and the Thanksgiving, all the people present express assent by saying, Amen.

The word Amen in the Hebrew language means,

νει. Εὐχαριστήσαντος δὲ τοῦ προεστῶτος καὶ ἐπευφημήσαντος παντὸς τοῦ λαοῦ οἱ καλούμενοι παρ' ἡμῖν διάκονοι διδόασιν ἑκάστῳ τῶν παρόντων μεταλαβεῖν ἀπὸ τοῦ εὐχαριστηθέντος ἄρτου καὶ οἴνου καὶ ὕδατος καὶ τοῖς οὐ παροῦσιν ἀποφέρουσι.

So be it. And, when the president has made the Thanksgiving, and all the people have expressed their assent, they who among us are called deacons give to each of those present a portion of the bread and wine and water over which the Thanksgiving has been made, and they carry to those who are not present.

PAGE 12.

St. Justin Martyr, *Apol.* i. 67.

Καί, ὡς προέφημεν, παυσαμένων ἡμῶν τῆς εὐχῆς ἄρτος προσφέρεται καὶ οἶνος καὶ ὕδωρ, καὶ ὁ προεστὼς εὐχὰς ὁμοίως καὶ εὐχαριστίας ὅση δύναμις αὐτῷ ἀναπέμπει καὶ ὁ λαὸς ἐπευφημεῖ λέγων τὸ ἀμήν· καὶ ἡ διάδοσις καὶ ἡ μετάληψις ἀπὸ τῶν εὐχαριστηθέντων ἑκάστῳ γίνεται καὶ τοῖς οὐ παροῦσι διὰ τῶν διακόνων πέμπεται.

And, as we said before, when we have finished our prayer, bread is brought and wine and water, and the president sends up both prayers and Thanksgivings as best he can, and the people express assent by saying the Amen. And there is the distribution and the partaking by each one of those things over which the Thanksgiving has been said, and these are sent to those who are not present by the hands of the deacons.

PAGES 12, 13.

Canons of Hippolytus, 214, 215.

On the first day the bishop at the time of Mass is to distribute with his own hand, if he can, offerings to all the people. If a presbyter is ill, the deacon is to take the Sacrament to him, and the presbyter is to receive it by himself.

PAGE 13.

Tertullian, *De orat.* 19.

Similiter et stationum diebus non putant plerique sacrificiorum orationibus interveniendum quod statio soluenda sit accepto corpore domini. Ergo deuotum deo obsequium eucharistia resoluit an magis deo obligat? Nonne sollemnior erit statio tua si et ad aram dei steteris? Accepto corpore domini et reseruato utrumque saluum est, et participatio sacrificii et executio officii.

In like manner, also, concerning the days of stations, very many think that they must not be present at the sacrificial prayers because the station is to be ended when the Lord's body has been received. Does then the Eucharist break up a service devoted to God, or bind it more to God? Will not your station be the more solemn if also you have stood at the altar of God? When the body of the Lord has been received and kept, both are secured, both the participation in the sacrifice and the fulfilment of the duty.

PAGE 13.

Tertullian, *Ad uxorem*, ii. 5.

Non sciet maritus quid secreto ante omnem cibum gustes? Et si sciuerit panem, non illum credit esse qui dicitur?

Will not your husband know what you taste in secret before any food? And, if he knows it to be bread, does he not believe it to be that which is reported?

PAGE 14.

St. Cyprian, *De lapsis*, 26.

Et cum quaedam arcam suam in quo domini sanctum fuit manibus inmundis temptasset aperire, igne inde surgente deterrita est ne auderet adtingere.

And when a certain woman tried to open her box in which was the holy thing of the Lord with unclean hands [*i.e.* defiled through having taken part in a heathen sacrifice], she was terrified by fire rising out of it so that she dared not touch it.

PAGE 14.

St. Basil, *Ep.* xciii.

Τὸ δὲ ἐν τοῖς τοῦ διωγμοῦ καιροῖς ἀναγκάζεσθαί τινα μὴ παρόντος ἱερέως ἢ λειτουργοῦ τὴν κοινωνίαν λαμβάνειν τῇ ἰδίᾳ χειρὶ μηδαμῶς εἶναι βαρὺ περιττόν ἐστι ἀπο-

It is unnecessary to point out that for any one in times of persecution to be compelled to receive the Communion by his own hand when no priest or minister is pre-

δεικνύναι διὰ τὸ καὶ τὴν μακρὰν συνήθειαν τοῦτο δι' αὐτῶν τῶν πραγμάτων πιστώσασθαι. Πάντες γὰρ οἱ κατὰ τὰς ἐρήμους μονάζοντες ἔνθα μή ἐστιν ἱερεύς κοινωνίαν οἴκοι κατέχοντες ἀφ' ἑαυτῶν μεταλαμβάνουσιν.

sent is by no means a grave offence, since long custom sanctions this from the facts themselves. For all the solitaries in the deserts, where there is no priest, having Communion at home receive it from themselves.

Ἐν Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ δὲ καὶ ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ ἕκαστος καὶ τῶν ἐν λαῷ τελούντων ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ πλεῖστον ἔχει κοινωνίαν ἐν τῷ οἰκῷ αὐτοῦ καὶ ὅτε βούλεται μεταλάμβανει δι' ἑαυτοῦ. Ἅπαξ γὰρ τὴν θυσίαν τοῦ ἱερέως τελειώσαντος καὶ δεδωκότος ὁ λαβὼν αὐτὴν ὡς ὅλην ὁμοῦ καθ' ἑκάστην μεταλαμβάνων παρὰ τοῦ δεδωκότος εἰκότως μεταλαμβάνειν καὶ ὑποδέχεσθαι πιστεύειν ὀφείλει. . . . Ταὐτὸν τοίνυν ἐστὶ τῇ δυνάμει εἴτε μίαν μερίδα δέξεταί τις παρὰ τοῦ ἱερέως εἴτε πολλὰς μερίδας ὁμοῦ.

And at Alexandria and in Egypt each one of the laity for the most part keeps Communion in his house, and receives it by his own hand when he wishes. For, when once the priest has completed the sacrifice and has administered, he who has taken it receiving it each time as entire ought to believe that he properly receives and partakes from him who administered. . . . It has then the same validity whether one receives one portion from the priest or many portions at the same time.

PAGES 14, 15.

St. Jerome, *Ep.* xlviii. 15.

Scio Romae hanc esse consuetudinem ut fideles semper Christi corpus accipiant, quod nec reprehendo nec probo. . . . Sed . . . quare ad martyres ire non audent? quare non ingrediuntur ecclesias? An alias in publico, alius in domo Christus est? Quod in ecclesia non licet, nec domo licet.

I know that at Rome it is the custom for the faithful always [*i.e.* even when under ceremonial defilement] to receive the body of Christ. This I neither blame nor approve. . . . But . . . why do they not dare to go to the martyrs. Why do they not enter the churches? Is Christ one in public, and another in a house? What is not lawful in church is not lawful at home.

PAGES 15, 16.

Dionysius of Alexandria, *Ep. ad Fab. apud* Eusebius, *H.E.* vi. 44.

Σαραπίων τις ἦν παρ' ἡμῖν πιστὸς γέρων, ἀμέμπτως μὲν τὸν πολὺν διαβιώσας χρόνον, ἐν δὲ τῷ πειρασμῷ πεσών. Οὗτος πολλάκις ἐδεῖτο καὶ οὐδεὶς προσεῖχεν αὐτῷ καὶ γὰρ ἐτεθύκει· ἐν νόσῳ δὲ γενόμενος

There was one Sarapion among us, an aged believer, who had long lived without blame but fell in the trial. He besought often, and no one gave heed to him, for he had sacrificed. He became ill and for three successive days remained

τριῶν ἑξῆς ἡμερῶν ἄφωνος καὶ ἀναίσθητος διετέλεσε. Βραχὺ δὲ ἀνασφήλας τῇ τετάρτῃ προσεκαλέσατο τὸν θυγατριδοῦν καὶ Μέχρι τίνος, φησίν, ὦ τέκνον, με κατέχετε; δέομαι, σπεύσατε καί μεθᾶττον ἀπολύσατε. τῶν πρεσβυτέρων μοί τινα κάλεσον. Καὶ ταῦτα εἰπών, πάλιν ἦν ἄφωνος. Ἔδραμεν ὁ παῖς ἐπὶ τὸν πρεσβύτερον· νὺξ δὲ ἦν, κἀκεῖνος ἠσθένει. Ἀφικέσθαι μὲν οὖν οὐκ ἐδυνήθη, ἐντολῆς δὲ ὑπ' ἐμοῦ δεδομένης τοὺς ἀπαλλαττομένους τοῦ βίου, εἰ δέοιντο, καὶ μάλιστα εἰ καὶ πρότερον ἱκετεύσαντες τύχοιεν, ἀφίεσθαι ἵν' εὐέλπιδες ἀπαλλάττωνται, βραχὺ τῆς εὐχαριστίας ἔδωκεν τῷ παιδαρίῳ ἀποβρέξαι κελεύσας καὶ τῷ πρεσβύτῃ κατὰ τοῦ στόματος ἐπιστάξαι. Ἐπανῆκεν ὁ παῖς φέρων· ἐγγύς τε γενομένου πρὶν

speechless and unconscious. Having recovered a little on the fourth day, he sent for his daughter's son, and said, How long do you detain me, my child? Make haste, I pray, and release me more quickly. Call one of the presbyters to me. And, when he had said this, he again became speechless. And the boy ran to the presbyter. But it was night, and he was ill. As then he could not come, and as I had given direction that those at the point of death, if they asked for it, and especially if previously they had supplicated for it, should be absolved, so that they might depart with a good hope, he gave to the boy a small piece of the Eucharist, and told him to moisten it and drop it into the old man's mouth. The boy returned with it. And,

εἰσελθεῖν ἀνενέγκας πάλιν ὁ Σαραπίων Ἥκεις, ἔφη, τέκνον; καὶ ὁ μὲν πρεσβύτερος ἐλθεῖν οὐκ ἠδυνήθη, σὺ δὲ ποίησον ταχέως τὸ προσταχθέν, καὶ ἀπάλλαττέ με. Ἀπέβρεξεν ὁ παῖς καὶ ἅμα τε ἐνέχεε τῷ στόματι, καὶ μικρὸν ἐκεῖνος καταβροχθίσας εὐθέως ἐπέδωκε τὸ πνεῦμα.

when he came near, before he had entered, Sarapion revived again and said, Are you here, child? And the presbyter could not come; but do quickly what he ordered, and let me depart. And the boy moistened it, and as soon as he had poured it into his mouth and he had swallowed a little, Sarapion at once gave up the ghost.

PAGE 17.

St. Optatus, *De schism. Don.* ii. 19, 21.

Iusserunt Eucharistiam canibus fundi. . . . Quid iniquius quam . . . altaria frangere, Eucharistiam animalibus proiicere?

They ordered the Eucharist to be thrown to dogs. . . . What is more wicked than . . . to break down altars, to throw the Eucharist to beasts?

PAGE 17.

St. Chrysostom, *Ep. ad Innoc.* i. 3.

Ἀλλ' ἔνθα τὰ ἅγια ἀπέκειντο εἰσελθόντες οἱ στρατιῶται, ὧν ἔνιοι καθ' ὡς ἔγνωμεν ἀμύητοι ἦσαν, πάντα τε ἑώρων τὰ ἔνδον, καὶ τὸ ἁγιώτατον

But the soldiers, of whom some, as we knew, were unbaptized, entered the place where the holy gifts were reserved, and saw all things that were within; and, as might

αἷμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὡς ἐν τοσούτῳ θορύβῳ, εἰς τὰ τῶν προειρημένων στρατιώτων ἱμάτια ἐξεχεῖτο.

easily happen in such a tumult, the most holy blood of Christ was spilt on the garments of these soldiers.

PAGES 17, 18.

Const. Ap. VIII. xiii. 4.

Καὶ ὅταν πάντες μεταλάβωσι καὶ πᾶσαι, λαβόντες οἱ διάκονοι τὰ περισσεύσαντα εἰσφερέτωσαν εἰς τὰ παστοφόρια.

And, when all, both men and women, have received, the deacons are to take what remains and carry it into the sacristy.

PAGE 19.

St. Jerome, *Ep.* cxxv. 20.

Nihil illo ditius qui corpus domini canistro uimineo, sanguinem portat in uitro.

Nothing is more rich than he who carries the Lord's body in a wicker basket, and His blood in a vessel of glass.

PAGE 19.

St. Cyprian, *Ep.* v. 2.

Nam etsi fratres pro dilectione sua cupidi sunt ad conueniendum et uisitandum confessores bonos quos inlustrauit iam gloriosis initiis diuina digratio, tamen caute hoc

For, although the brethren in their love are desirous to assemble and visit the good confessors on whom the divine favour has already poured brightness by glorious be-

et non glomeratim nec per multitudinem semel iunctam puto esse faciendum ne ex hoc ipso inuidia concitetur et introeundi aditus denegetur et dum insatiabiles multum uolumus totum perdamus. Consulite ergo et prouidete ut cum temperamento fieri hoc tutius possit ita ut presbyteri quoque qui illic apud confessores offerunt singuli cum singulis diaconis per uices alternent quia et mutatio personarum et uicissitudo conuenientium minuit inuidiam.

ginnings, yet I am of opinion that this should be done cautiously, and not in crowds, nor by a multitude gathered together at once, lest from this very thing envy be excited and access denied, and, while unsated we wish for much, we lose all. Consider therefore and take care that by moderation this may be done more safely, so that the presbyters also who there offer among the confessors may severally take turns with different deacons, because both the change of persons and the variation in those who assemble lessen envy.

PAGE 20.

Dionysius of Alexandria, *Ep. ad frat. apud* Eusebius, *H.E.* vii. 22.

Πρῶτον μὲν ἡμᾶς ἤλασαν, καὶ μόνοι πρὸς ἁπάντων διωκόμενοι καὶ θανατούμενοι ἑορτάσαμεν καὶ τότε, καὶ πᾶς ὁ τῆς καθ' ἕκαστον θλί-

First, they drove us into exile, and, when alone and persecuted by all and put to death, even then we kept the feast; and every place of each

ψεως τόπος πανηγυρικὸν ἡμῖν γέγονε χωρίον, ἀγρός, ἐρημία, ναῦς, πανδοχεῖον, δεσμωτήριον.

several affliction became for us a place of solemn assembly, field, desert, ship, inn, prison.

PAGE 20.

Philostorgius, *H.E.* ii. 13.

Ὅτι τὸν μάρτυρα Λουκιανόν φησὶ μέλλοντα τελευτᾶν, καὶ μήτε ναὸν μήτε θυσιαστήριον τῆς τυραννικῆς βίας παρεχούσης, ἀλλὰ μηδὲ αὐτοῦ κινεῖσθαι τῶν δεσμῶν καὶ πληγῶν συγχωρούντων, ἐν τῷ οἰκείῳ στέρνῳ ἀνακείμενον τὴν φρικτὴν θυσίαν τελεσάμενον, οὕτω τε αὐτὸν μετασχεῖν καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους μεταλαβεῖν τοῦ ἀχράντου θύματος ἐπιτρέψαι. Ἐτελέσθε δὲ ἡ ἱερουργία ἐν τῇ εἱρκτῇ, τοῦ κυκλώσαντος αὐτὸν ἱεροῦ χοροῦ ὡς ἤδη ἀποβιοῦντα ἐκκλησίας σχῆμα καὶ ἀσφάλειαν τοῦ μὴ καθορᾶσθαι τὰ δρώμενα παρὰ τῶν ἀσεβούντων ἀναπλεροῦντος.

The martyr Lucian being near death, and when the tyrannical violence allowed him neither shrine nor altar, and when moreover his bonds and wounds did not allow him to move, celebrated the awful sacrifice on his own breast while lying down, so that he himself partook and allowed others to partake of the undefiled offering. And the sacred rite was celebrated in the prison, the sacred band which surrounded him as already dying supplying the form of a church and security against what was done being seen by the ungodly.

PAGE 20.

Paulinus, *Vita S. Ambrosii*, 10.

Cum trans Tiberim apud quamdam clarissimam inuitatus sacrificio in domo offerret. . .

When across the Tiber he was offering the sacrifice in a house at the request of a certain illustrious lady. . . .

PAGES 20, 21.

St. Augustine, *De ciu. Dei*, XXII. viii. 6.

Ubi cum adflictione animalium et seruorum suorum domum suam spirituum malignorum uim noxiam perpeti comperisset, rogauit nostros me absente presbyteros ut aliquis eorum illo pergeret cuius orationibus cederent. Perrexit unus, obtulit ibi sacrificium corporis Christi, orans quantum potuit ut cessaret illa uexatio: Deo protinus miserante cessauit.

There, when he [Hesperius] had found out by the suffering of his animals and servants that his house was afflicted by the evil power of wicked spirits, he asked our presbyters when I was absent if one of them would go thither, so that by his prayers the spirits might depart. One went and offered the sacrifice of the body of Christ there, praying with all his power that the trouble might cease. By the mercy of God it ceased at once.

PAGE 21.

Uranius, *Ep. de obitu S. Paulini*, 2.

Et quasi profecturus ad dominum iubet sibi ante lectulum suum sacra mysteria exhiberi scilicet ut una cum sanctis episcopis oblato sacrificio animam suam domino commendaret simul etiam et eos quos pro disciplina ecclesiastica a communione sacri mysterii extorres esse praeceperat ad pacem pristinam reuocaret.

And as about to go to the Lord he commands the sacred mysteries to be set forth at his bedside, so that together with the holy bishops he might with the offering of the sacrifice commend his soul to the Lord, and might also at the same time recall to former peace those whom he had perceived to be banished from the communion of the sacred mystery in the discipline of the Church.

PAGES 21, 22.

Council of Laodicea (between A.D. 343 and A.D. 381), 58.

Ὅτι οὐ δεῖ ἐν τοῖς οἴκοις προσφορὰς γίνεσθαι παρὰ ἐπισκόπων ἢ πρεσβυτέρων.

Offerings of the sacrifice by bishops or presbyters must not take place in houses.

PAGE 22.

St. Basil, *Reg. breu. tract.* 310.

Ἐρώτησις. Εἰ χρὴ εἰς κοινὸν οἶκον προσκομιδὴν γίνεσθαι.

Question. Whether it is right for the offering to be made in an ordinary house.

Ἀπόκρισις. Ὥσπερ οὐδὲν κοινὸν σκεῦος ἐπιτρέπει ὁ λόγος εἰσφέρεσθαι εἰς τὰ ἅγια, οὕτως οὐδὲ τὰ ἅγια εἰς κοινὸν οἶκον ἐπιτελεῖσθαι. . . . Ἐξ ὧν παιδευόμεθα μήτε τὸ κοινὸν δεῖπνον ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ ἐσθίειν καὶ πίνειν μήτε τὸ κυριακὸν δεῖπνον ἐν οἰκίᾳ καθυβρίζειν ἔκτος εἰ μὴ ἐν ἀνάγκῃ ἐπιλεξηταί τις καθαρώτερον τόπον ἢ οἶκον ἐν καιρῷ εὐθέτῳ.

Answer. As the word does not permit an ordinary vessel to be brought into the sanctuary, so neither does it permit the holy gifts to be celebrated in an ordinary house. . . . Whence we are taught neither to eat and drink our ordinary supper in a church nor to insult the Lord's supper in a house unless in necessity one choose a purer place or house on a suitable occasion.

PAGE 22.

Council *in Trullo* (A.D. 691), can. 31.

Τοὺς ἐν εὐκτηρίοις οἴκοις ἔνδον οἰκίας τυγχάνουσι λειτουργούντας ἢ βαπτίζοντας κληρικοὺς ὑπὸ γνώμης τοῦτο πράττειν τοῦ κατὰ τόπον ἐπισκόπου ὁρίζομεν· ὥστε εἴ τις κληρικὸς μὴ τοῦτο οὕτω παραφυλάττοι, καθαιρείσθω.

We decree that clergy who celebrate or baptize in oratories in a house are to do this subject to the decision of the bishop of the place. Therefore, if any clergyman does not conform to this, he is to be deposed.

PAGES 23, 24.

Council of Bourges (A.D. 1031), can. 2.

Item quia corpus domini per ecclesias paroecianas dicebatur nimia uetustate neglectum, statuerunt episcopi in eodem concilio ut corpus domini non plus seruetur quam a dominica in alteram.

Inasmuch as it has been said that the body of the Lord has been neglected in parish churches by being left too long, the bishops in the same council have decreed that the body of the Lord be not reserved longer than from one Lord's Day to another.

PAGES 23, 24.

Council of Westminster (A.D. 1138), can. 2.

Sancimus etiam ut ultra octo dies corpus Christi non reseruetur neque ad infirmos nisi per sacerdotem aut per diaconum, aut necessitate instante per quemlibet cum summa reuerentia deferatur.

We enact also that the body of Christ be not reserved for more than eight days, and that it be carried to the sick only by a priest or by a deacon, or in urgent necessity by any one with the greatest reverence.

PAGES 23, 24.

Fourth Lateran Council (A.D. 1215), cap. 20.

Statuimus ut in cunctis ecclesiis chrisma et Eucharistia sub fideli custodia clauibus adhibitis con-

We decree that in all churches the chrism and the Eucharist be kept under faithful guard and

seruentur ne possit ad illa temeraria manus extendi ad aliqua horribilia uel nefaria exercenda.

be locked up, so that no presumptuous hand can be laid on them for any horrible or wicked purpose.

PAGE 24.

Council of Reading (A.D. 1279), cap. 7.

Dignissimum Eucharistiae sacramentum praecipimus de cetero taliter custodiri ut uidelicet in bursa uel loculo propter comminutionis periculum nullatenus collocetur sed in pyxide pulcherrima intrinsecus lino candissimo adornata in qua ipsum corpus domini repositum in aliquo cooperticulo de serico purpura uel lino purissimo operiri praecipimus ita quod sine omni comminutionis periculo possit inde faciliter extrahi et imponi. Quod etiam sacramentum in omni quindena innouetur. Circumferatur autem cum debita reuerentia ad aegrotos sacerdote saltem induto superpellicio et

We charge that for the future the most worthy Sacrament of the Eucharist be so kept that it be not placed in a purse or bag because of the risk of breaking it, but in a beautiful pyx lined with the fairest linen, in which we charge that the Lord's body be laid and be covered with a veil of silk or fine cloth or most pure linen, so that it can easily thence be taken out and put in without any danger of breaking. Also this Sacrament is to be renewed every fifteenth day. And it is to be carried with due reverence to the sick, the priest having on at least a surplice and wearing a

gerente orarium cum lumine praeuio in lucerna et tintinnabulo sonoro ut populus ad reuerentiam debitam excitetur qui ad prosternendum se uel orandum saltem humiliter sacerdotali informetur prudentia ubicunque regem gloriae sub panis latibulo eueniret deportari.

stole, with a light in a lantern before him, and a sounding bell so that the people may be roused to due reverence, who are to be discreetly instructed by the priest that they prostrate themselves, or at least humbly pray, wherever it may happen that the King of Glory is carried under the covering of bread.

PAGE 24.

Council of Lambeth (A.D. 1281), cap. 1.

Statuimus . . . ut in qualibet ecclesia parochiali fiat tabernaculum cum clausura decens et honestum secundum curae magnitudinem et ecclesiae facultates in quo ipsum corpus domini in pyxide pulcherrima et lineis tegumentis sed nullatenus in loculo propter comminutionis deuitandum periculum collocetur ; quod in omni dominica praecipimus renouari.

We decree . . . that in every parish church there be a tabernacle with a lock, fair and comely according to the greatness of the cure and the value of the church, in which the body of the Lord itself is to be placed in a beautiful pyx and with linen coverings, but not in a bag, so as to avoid the danger of breaking ; and we charge that this be renewed every Lord's Day.

PAGES 25, 26.

Lyndwood, *Prouinciale*, iii. 25.

Simile habes *extra. de celeb. Mis. c. sane*, ubi dicitur quod in loco singulari mundo et signato debet seruari Eucharistia. Et ex hoc uidetur quod usus obseruatus in Anglia ut scil. in conopeo pendeat super altare non est commendabilis quia contra mentem dicti *c. sane* ubi statuitur quod non custodiatur in loco patenti sed singulari. Licet enim consuetudo Anglicana commendabilis sit illa consideratione qua citius repraesentatur nostris aspectibus adoranda, non tamen est commendabilis eo respectu quo ponitur in loco publico sic quod ad eam manus temerariae de facili ualeant extendi. Nam licet in cupa quae forsan clausa est pendeat, tamen ad illam deorsum mittendam uel forsan cum illa cupa totaliter auferendam ma-

There is a like provision *extra. de celeb. Mis. c. sane* [*i.e. Decretalia*, III. xli. 10], where it is said that the Eucharist ought to be reserved in a place separate, clean, and indicated. And from this it seems that the custom observed in England, namely, that it should hang in a canopy over the altar is not to be commended because it is against the intention of the aforesaid *c. sane*, where it is decreed that the Eucharist should be kept not in an open place but in a separate place. For though the English custom is to be commended for the reason that the Sacrament is more readily presented to our eyes so that we may adore, yet it is not to be commended in that the Sacrament is put in a public place so that pre-

nus temerariae de facili possunt apponi. Et ideo ut mihi uidetur commendabilior est usus aliorum locorum quae uidi viz. in Hollandia et Portugallia in quibus ordinatur unus locus singularis honestus prope altare in quo reponitur Eucharistia sub clauibus intra parietes uel locum bene munitum conseruanda sic quod nullus ad ipsam Eucharistiam accedere poterit nisi sacerdos loci illius clauem custodiens.

sumptuous hands can easily be stretched out to it. For, though it hangs in a cup which is perhaps closed, yet presumptuous hands can easily be put on it to pull it down or perhaps carry away cup and all. And therefore, as it seems to me, the custom of other places which I have seen is more to be commended, namely, in Holland and Portugal, where a seemly separate place near the altar is appointed, in which the Eucharist is placed to be kept locked up within the wall or securely fastened place, so that no one can get at the Eucharist itself except the parish priest who keeps the key.

The provision of the canon law referred to by Lyndwood (*Decretalia*, III. xli. 10) is as follows: PAGES 25, 26.

Ne propter incuriam sacerdotum diuina indignatio grauius exardescat,

Lest because of the carelessness of priests the wrath of God be more

districte praecipiendo mandamus quatenus a sacerdotibus Eucharistia in loco singulari mundo et signato semper honorifice collocata deuote ac fideliter conseruetur.

grievously inflamed, we strictly charge and command that the Eucharist be always put by priests with honour in a place separate, clean, and indicated, and that it be kept piously and faithfully.

PAGE 26.

Council of Lambeth (A.D. 1281), cap. I.

Solis enim celebrantibus sanguinem sub specie uini consecrati sumere in huiusmodi minoribus ecclesiis est concessum.

For to celebrants alone is it allowed in lesser churches of this kind to receive the blood under the species of the consecrated wine.

PAGE 55.

Fulbert of Chartres, *Ep.* iii.

Ante hos paucos dies ut meminisse licet mihi uestipertinis horis superuenisti et repentina inquisitione me permouisti de hostia quam paulo ante promotus ad sacerdotium de manu episcopi suscepisti, quae ratio est uidelicet usque ad quadragesimam diem usu quo-

A few days ago, as one may remember, you broke in on me at evening, and startled me with a sudden enquiry about the host which a little before you had received from the hand of the bishop when raised to the priesthood, what is the reason for consuming this by

tidiano consumere uel quos huius rei auctores haberemus. . . . Putabam et hoc certe omnibus ecclesiis eatenus assuetum fore ut nulli nouum esse uideretur aut uanum. . . . Nostri enim episcopi prouinciales in huiusmodi ritum omnes consentiunt.

daily use for forty days, and whom we count the originators of this custom. . . . I had thought this certainly to be so much the custom of all Churches as not to seem new or useless to any one. . . . For the bishops of our province all concur in using a ceremony of this kind.

PAGES 58–60.

St. Gregory of Nazianzus, *Orat.* viii. 18 (quoted at length in English on pages 58–60).

Πάντων ἀπογνοῦσα τῶν ἄλλων ἐπὶ τὸν πάντων ἰατρὸν καταφεύγει, καὶ νυκτὸς ἀωρίαν τηρήσασα, μικρὸν ἐνδούσης αὐτῇ τῆς νόσου, τῷ θυσιαστηρίῳ προσπίπτει μετὰ τῆς πίστεως, καὶ τὸν ἐπ' αὐτῷ τιμώμενον ἀνακαλουμένη μεγάλῃ τῇ βοῇ καὶ πάσαις τοῖς κλήσεσι, καὶ πασῶν αὐτὸν τῶν πώποτε δυνάμεων ὑπομνήσασα, σοφὴ γὰρ ἐκείνη καὶ τὰ παλαιὰ καὶ τὰ νέα, εὐσεβῆ τινα καὶ καλὴν ἀναισχυντίαν ἀναισχυντεῖ· μιμεῖται τὴν τοῖς κρασπέδοις Χριστοῦ ξηράνασαν πηγὴν αἵματος. Καὶ τί ποιεῖ; Τῷ θυσιαστηρίῳ τὴν κεφαλὴν ἑαυτῆς προσθεῖσα μετὰ τῆς ἴσης βοῆς, καὶ δάκρυσι τοῦτο πλουσίοις, ὥσπέρ τις πάλαι τοὺς πόδας Χριστοῦ καταβρέχουσα, καὶ μὴ πρότερον ἀνήσειν ἢ τῆς ὑγείας τυχεῖν ἀπειλοῦσα εἶτα τῷ παρ' ἑαυτῆς φαρμάκῳ τούτῳ τὸ σῶμα πᾶν

ἐπαλείφουσα, καὶ εἴ πού τι τῶν ἀντιτύπων τοῦ τιμίου σώματος ἢ τοῦ αἵματος ἡ χεὶρ ἐθησαύρισεν, τοῦτο καταμιγνῦσα τοῖς δάκρυσιν, ὦ τοῦ θαύματος, ἀπῆλθεν εὐθὺς αἰσθομένη τῆς σωτηρίας, κούφη καὶ σῶμα καὶ ψυχὴν καὶ διάνοιαν, μισθὸν ἐλπίδος λαβοῦσα τὸ ἐλπιζόμενον, καὶ τῇ τῆς ψυχῆς εὐρωστίᾳ κομισαμένη τὴν τοῦ σώματος. Ταῦτα μεγάλα μέν, οὐ ψευδῆ δέ.

PAGE 71.

Statutes of the Council of Cologne (A.D. 1452).

Item ad maiorem honorem sanctissimi sacramenti statuimus quod deinceps ipsum sanctissimum sacramentum nullatenus uisibiliter in quibuscumque monstrantiis ponatur aut deferatur nisi in sanctissimo festo corporis Christi cum suis octauis semel in anno in qualibet ciuitate aut oppido seu parochia, uel ex singulari indulto ordinarii, aut alias pro pace, aut alia necessitate imminente ex indispositione rempublicam praegrauante: et tunc cum summa reuerentia atque de-

Also for the greater honour of the most holy Sacrament we decree that hereafter the said most holy Sacrament is on no account to be placed or carried visibly in monstrances of any kind except on the most holy feast of Corpus Christi with its octaves once in the year in any city or town or parish, or by special permission of the Ordinary, or otherwise to pray for peace, or when some other necessity is urgent from the pressure of civil trouble; and then with the greatest

uotione: in praemissis tamen laudabilibus consuetudinibus huius metropoliticae et cathedralium ecclesiarum suffraganeorum eiusdem semper saluis.

reverence and devotion; the laudable customs, nevertheless, of this metropolitical church, and of its suffragan cathedral churches always being preserved in the foregoing.

PAGES 81, 82.

Council of Nicaea (A.D. 325), can. 13 (quoted at length in English on pages 81, 82).

Περὶ δὲ τῶν ἐξοδευόντων ὁ παλαιὸς καὶ κανονικὸς νόμος φυλαχθήσεται καὶ νῦν, ὥστε εἴ τις ἐξοδεύοι τοῦ τελευταίου καὶ ἀναγκαιοτάτου ἐφοδίου μὴ ἀποστερεῖσθαι. . . . Καθόλου δὲ καὶ περὶ παντὸς οὑτινοσοῦν ἐξοδεύοντος αἰτοῦντος δὲ μετασχεῖν εὐχαριστίας ὁ ἐπίσκοπος μετὰ δοκιμασίας ἐπιδότῳ.

PAGE 83.

St. Cyril of Alexandria, *Ep. ad Calosyr.* (quoted at length in English on page 83).

Ἀκούω δὲ ὅτι εἰς ἁγιασμὸν ἀπρακτεῖν φησὶν τὴν μυστικὴν εὐλογίαν εἰ ἀπομένοι λείψανον αὐτῆς εἰς ἑτέραν ἡμέραν. Μαίνονται δὲ ταῦτα λέγοντες. Οὐ γὰρ ἀλλοιοῦται Χριστός, οὐδὲ τὸ ἅγιον αὐτοῦ σῶμα μεταβληθήσεται, ἀλλ' ἡ τῆς εὐλογίας δύναμις καὶ ἡ ζωοποιὸς χάρις διηνεκής ἐστιν ἐν αὐτῷ.

Index of Subjects

Adoration, Eucharistic, 25, 63, 64, 66, 69, 90–93, 97, 98, 103

Benediction with the Eucharist, 73–76, 101–109, 116

Communion of the Sick, 8, 9, 11–50, 77–90

Development :
in doctrine, 94, 95
in practice, 95, 96
tests of development, 96–100
Doctrine, Relation of, to reservation, 82–84, 96–98, 107, 108

Early Church and reservation, 11–19, 55, 56, 77
Eastern Church and reservation, 27, 28, 51, 65, 69, 70, 73, 76, 78, 91, 92

England, Church of, and reservation, 23–26, 28–34, 42–50, 62–65, 80, 83–90, 100, 102, 115, 116
Exposition of the Eucharist, 70–73, 101–103, 108, 116

Middle Ages, 23–26, 62–68, 78

Nonjurors, 37–42

Place of reservation, 13–18, 23–28, 36, 37, 41, 91–101
Prayer before reserved Sacrament, 57–65, 91–101, 109–116
Pressing character of questions about reservation, 7–10
Processions of the Eucharist, 65–70, 103, 106–108

Reservation :
in one kind, 18, 19, 26, 27
in two kinds, 18, 19, 27, 36
Reserved Sacrament, Communion from :
in church, 27
of the sick, 11–18, 23–50, 76–82, 87–90
of others absent from church, 11–15, 18, 35, 36
Rome, Church of :
and reservation, 26, 27, 69–76, 99, 104–106, 110
changed attitude towards, 7, 8

Scottish Church and reservation, 35–37, 79
Sick, Communion of : see Communion of the Sick
Spiritual profit through reservation, 78–82, 99, 100

Index of Quotations

Ancren Riwle, 62–64
Apostolic Constitutions, 17, 18, 125
Articles of Religion, 33, 34
Atchley, E. G. C. F., 53
Augustine, 20, 21, 128

Basil, 14, 22, 120, 129, 130
Benedict XV, Pope, 27
Bradford, J., 97
Brett, T., 38
Bright, W., 82
Butler, C., 14

Canterbury Convocation, 46–50
Cardwell, E., 35
Chandler, Bishop A., 114, 115
Cherubini, A., 68, 72
Chrysostom, 17, 124, 125
Clement VIII, Pope, 72
Collier, J., 38
Cosin, J., 43
Councils :
Auxerre (578), 55
Basle (1434), 68

Councils:
Bourges (1031), 23, 24, 131
Carthage (397), 55
Chelsea (816), 56
Cologne (1452), 71, 138, 139
Hippo (393), 55
Lambeth (1281), 26, 136
Lateran IV (1215), 23, 24, 131, 132
Laodicea (between 343 and 381), 21, 22, 51, 52, 129
Nicaea (325), 81, 82, 139
Reading (1279), 24, 132
Trent (1545–1563), 69
in Trullo (691), 22, 51, 52, 56, 130
Westminster (1138), 23, 24, 131
Cranmer, T., 97
Cyprian, 14, 19, 120, 125, 126
Cyril of Alexandria, 83, 139

Dalgairns, J. B., 62, 63
Deacon, T., 38, 40
Decretales Gregorii Papae IX, 25, 135, 136
Dickinson, F. H., 68
Dionysius of Alexandria, 20, 126, 127
Douglas, Bishop A. G., 78, 79
Duchesne, L., 53, 54

Ecclesiastical Discipline, Report of Royal Commission on (1906), 107
Eeles, F. C., 37, 79
Egbert, Excerpts of, 23, 24
Egbert, Pontifical of, 56
Eugenius IV, Pope, 68

Field, R., 97
Frere, W. H., 68
Fulbert of Chartres, 55, 136, 137

Gasquet, Abbot F. A., 64
Gore, Bishop C., 49
Gregory of Nazianzus, 58–61, 137, 138
Gregory I, Pope, 56
Gregory IX, Pope: see *Decretales*

Hatt, W., 37
Hedley, Bishop J. C., 104–106
Hefele, Bishop C. J., 82
Henderson, W. G., 68
Hereford Missal, 67, 68
Hippolytus, Canons of, 12, 13, 119

Innocent I, Pope, 53
Irenaeus, 52

Jerome, 14, 15, 19, 122, 125

John of Rouen, 67
Justin Martyr, 12, 18, 117, 118

Keble, J., 79, 80
Kellner, K. A. H., 71

Lacey, T. A., 88
Lanfranc, 65, 66, 70
Liber Pontificalis, 53
Lyndwood, W., 25, 26

Maclagan, Archbishop W. D., 87
Martin V, Pope, 68

Nonjuring Books, 37–42

Optatus, 17, 18, 124

Palladius, 14
Paulinus, 20, 128
Peccham, Archbishop J., 24, 26, 132, 133
Philostorgius, 20, 127
Poore Bishop R,,62
Prayer Book :
1549, 28–30
1552, 30, 31
1559, 31
1560, 31
1661, 32

Rattray, T., 42
Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum, 35
Rituale Romanum, 75

St. Albans, Acts of Abbots of, 67
Sarum Consuetudinary, 67, 68
Sarum Missal, 68
Schouppe, F. X., 106
Scottish Communion Office, 35, 36, 88
Sparrow, A., 43, 44
Staley, V., 46

Taylor, J., 45, 46
Temple, Archbishop F., 83–90
Tertullian, 13, 18, 119, 120
Thiers, J. B., 74, 75
Thompson, E. M., 68
Thorndike, H., 44, 45, 88
Thurston, H., 57–62, 70, 71, 74, 75

Uranius, 21, 129

Weston, Bishop F., 109–114
Wordsworth, Christopher, 46

Printed for Herbert Scott, *Publisher*, Paternoster Row, London *by* Butler & Tanner Frome

LIBRARY OF HISTORIC THEOLOGY

EDITED BY

THE REV. WM. C. PIERCY, M.A.

Dean and Chaplain of Whitelands College.

Each Volume, Demy 8vo, Cloth, Red Burnished Top, 5s. net.

THE GREAT SCHISM BETWEEN THE EAST AND WEST.
By the Rev. F. J. FOAKES-JACKSON, D.D.

THE CATHOLIC CONCEPTION OF THE CHURCH.
By the Rev. W. J. SPARROW SIMPSON, D.D.

THE PRESENT RELATIONS OF SCIENCE AND RELIGION.
By the Rev. Professor T. G. BONNEY, D.Sc.

ARCHÆOLOGY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.
By Professor EDOUARD NAVILLE, D.C.L.

MYSTICISM IN CHRISTIANITY.
By the Rev. W. K. FLEMING, M.A., B.D.

COMMON OBJECTIONS TO CHRISTIANITY.
By the Rev. C. L. DRAWBRIDGE, M.A.

RELIGION IN AN AGE OF DOUBT.
By the Rev. C. J. SHEBBEARE, M.A.

THE RULE OF WORK AND WORSHIP.
By the Rev. R. L. OTTLEY, D.D.

THE RULE OF LIFE AND LOVE.
By the Rev. R. L. OTTLEY, D.D.

THE RULE OF FAITH AND HOPE.
By the Rev. R. L. OTTLEY, D.D.

MARRIAGE IN CHURCH AND STATE.
By the Rev. T. A. LACEY, M.A.

CHRISTIANITY AND OTHER FAITHS.
By the Rev. W. ST. CLAIR TISDALL, D.D.

THE BUILDING UP OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.
By the Rev. Canon R. B. GIRDLESTONE, M.A.

THE CHURCHES IN BRITAIN. *Vols. I and II.*
By the Rev. ALFRED PLUMMER, D.D.

CHARACTER AND RELIGION.
By the Rev. The Hon. EDWARD LYTTELTON, M.A.

THE CREEDS: Their History, Nature and Use.
By the Rev. HAROLD SMITH, M.A.

THE CHRISTOLOGY OF ST. PAUL (Hulsean Prize Essay).
By the Rev. S. NOWELL ROSTRON, M.A.

MISSIONARY METHODS, ST. PAUL'S OR OURS?
By the Rev. ROLAND ALLEN, M.A.

"The 'Library of Historic Theology' is a project of great promise. Several volumes by eminent writers have already appeared and the issue of such a series amply demonstrates that there is no decline in the interest felt all through the ages in theological literature."—*Homiletic Review.*

Further important announcements will be made in due course; full particulars may be obtained from the Publisher, Robert Scott, Paternoster Row, London, E.C.

LONDON: ROBERT SCOTT, PATERNOSTER ROW, E.C.

DATE DUE			
OCT 23 '91			
NOV 28 '91			
MAY 27 1992			

HIGHSMITH # 45220

Stone, Darwell

AUTHOR

The Reserved Sacrament

TITLE

DATE LOANED	BORROWER'S NAME	DATE RETURNED
NOV 12 '73	Pfaff	DEC 12 '73
1992	Chevey	

63388

GENERAL THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
00029752